

EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION

ITS ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

BY

VARIOUS CONTRIBUTORS

Under the direction of
EDWARD EYRE

IN SEVEN VOLUMES
VOLUME IV
THE REFORMATION

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD

1936

**OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS**

**AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
London Edinburgh Glasgow
New York Toronto Melbourne
Capetown Bombay Calcutta
Madras**

HUMPHREY MILFORD

**PUBLISHER TO THE
UNIVERSITY**

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

THE REFORMATION ON THE CONTINENT <i>By L. CRISTIANI</i>	I
THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND <i>By F. M. POWICKE</i>	349
THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND <i>By W. E. BROWN, M.A., D.D.</i>	489
THE 'REFORMATION' IN IRELAND <i>By MYLES V. RONAN, C.C., M.R.I.A., F.R.S.A.I.</i>	561
LEGISLATION OF THE CHANGE OF RELIGION (a) IN ENGLAND, (b) IN SCOTLAND, (c) IN IRELAND	631
RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION <i>By CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS</i>	661
INDEX	725

ERRATA

- Page 27, line 14, *for Heiler read Geiler.*
- Page 29, line 29, *for Langerstein read Langenstein.*
- Page 76, line 29, *for archdukes read archduke.*
- Page 91, line 11, *for both kinds read one kind.*
- Page 131, line 27, *for uncle read cousin.*
- Page 147, note 2, *for Herminjart read Hermingard.*
- Page 189, line 19, *for Ten read Seven.*
- Page 190, line 36, *for Maximilian I read Maximilian II.*
- Page 205, note 1, *for Thomas read Nicholas.*
- Page 221, line 9, *for 1452 read 1542.*
- Page 223, line 5, *for Genoa read Geneva.*
- Page 270, line 29, *for Granville read Granvelle.*

THE REFORMATION ON THE CONTINENT

By L. CRISTIANI, Doyen de la Faculté des Lettres, Professeur d’Histoire moderne et contemporaine à l’Université catholique de Lyon.

CONTENTS

THE REFORMATION ON THE CONTINENT <i>By L. CRISTIANI</i>	I
THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND <i>By F. M. POWICKE</i>	349
THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND <i>By W. E. BROWN, M.A., D.D.</i>	489
THE 'REFORMATION' IN IRELAND <i>By MYLES V. RONAN, C.C., M.R.I.A., F.R.S.A.I.</i>	561
LEGISLATION OF THE CHANGE OF RELIGION (a) IN ENGLAND, (b) IN SCOTLAND, (c) IN IRELAND	631
RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION <i>By CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS</i>	661
INDEX	725

INTRODUCTION

I

IN the preceding period we have seen how in the closing century of the Middle Ages various forces—religious, intellectual, political, and social—were deeply affecting and modifying the civilized life of the Christian West. Few realized at the time that these were the prelude of a tremendous change in the whole situation, and that a revolution was at hand which would alter the whole course of history for centuries to come. Looking back on the period with the light of after knowledge we are able to note some of the complex and interacting causes that led up to what is generally known as the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

The character and results of this movement have long been the subject of controversy, and, considering how various are the views taken of the subject, the term ‘Reformation’, which implies a change for the better, though in general use, has the drawback of suggesting a view of it that must inevitably be challenged by many. It also suggests a purely religious movement, though its causes, procedure, and results were political and social as well as religious. There is therefore something to be said for following the example set by the late Professor Seebohm, and describing it as the ‘Protestant Revolution’.

Some of the most important of the causes and tendencies that led up to it have been dealt with in our account of the preceding period. It is now agreed that political factors of the first importance intervened to exasperate and embitter the religious struggle, and ultimately to stabilize the resulting situation into a partition of the Christian West into mutually hostile camps. A preliminary survey of the political background against which the religious tragedy was played to its end is therefore essential.

This preliminary survey concluded, the narrative will be divided into three parts:

- I. The Protestant Revolution.
- II. The Catholic Reaction.
- III. The Drawn Battle.

At the time when the Protestant Revolution began there was in almost all the States of Europe a movement towards absolutism, towards the curbing or elimination of the power of nobles and feudal chiefs and the reduction of the privileges of provincial and civic jurisdictions. In some States or nations this movement had made greater progress than in others. In some countries there was a tendency to disintegration; others, on the contrary, had attained a high degree of political and territorial unity.

Politics still remained a personal and dynastic business. As a rule the aim and policy of a sovereign was first to be absolute master in his own country, and then to extend his power abroad. A claim of succession, the consequence of a marriage alliance, was a customary pretext alleged to justify a conquest; and annexations of new territory, whether by friendly agreement or successful war, were carried out without much regard for racial and national boundaries. Local and national jealousies played their part, but the idea of nationality as a force in international politics was still undeveloped.

At the same time, besides the 'Wars of Succession', war to secure the balance of power in Europe began to appear as an expedient for protecting the integrity and independence of States against the excessive aggrandizement of one power at the expense of its neighbours. The opening of the ocean ways for trade and colonization was soon to lead to wars of rivalry for these far-reaching gains.¹

War for the balance of power and rivalry in trade introduced an entirely novel element and employed a new instrument, permanent diplomacy. The Holy See was the first to set the example of maintaining permanent representatives with the powers. The Republic of Venice followed this example. It was not long before Machiavelli described with particular care the duties of an ambassador. Permanently organized diplomacy soon became a European institution. Diplomats were presently to establish themselves almost as a caste apart, deeply imbued

¹ For a fuller discussion of the political situation in pre-Reformation Europe, see M. Guiraud's section in Volume III.

with the sense of their own importance, devoted to their traditions, prone to the so-called 'realism' that made them regard the issues at stake from the narrow standpoint of an advocate for one side or the other, so that too often they treated international relations as independent of moral and religious laws and to be influenced only by interest and the mechanical interplay of forces.

To glance at the powers as they appeared in 1517: (a) England, though it had annexed Wales in the time of the Plantagenets, was ruled by the Tudors, a new royal line descended from Welsh squires who had married Plantagenet princesses. Though claiming the overlordship of Ireland, English rule in that island as yet included only districts in the east and south, and some towns outside this 'Pale'. Scotland had maintained her independence, and it was not till 1603 that Britain was united under one crown by the succession of the Stuart king, James of Scotland, to the last of the Tudors. This ended the long rivalry between Scotland and England, which had resulted in an alliance between Scotland and France, and a traditional friendship between Spain and England as a counterpoise to this connexion. It was not till the second half of the sixteenth century that Spain and England became enemies.

The Wars of the Roses had exhausted the strength of the feudal nobility in England. The Tudor family, which had ascended the throne in the person of Henry VII (1485–1509), aimed at establishing an absolutist régime and limiting the control of Parliament and the great nobles. It was to leave a legacy of problems for the Stuarts to solve, and Charles I was to atone for the errors and ambitions of Henry VIII and Elizabeth.

Three considerations dominated the policy of England. Having lost its continental possessions, with the exception of Calais and the Channel Islands (a last remnant of the duchy of Normandy), it tended to take little interest in events on the Continent, or to intervene merely as an arbitrator and to profit by internecine national conflicts. In the second place, at the

instigation of its rulers, it was soon to withdraw itself from the Roman jurisdiction, and finally to institute a separate Church. Thirdly, it was to turn to the sea, to realize at last the opportunities offered by its geographical situation once the Mediterranean ceased to be the centre and the main channel of maritime trade. So it was to become the great colonial power we know to-day.

The young sovereign, who in 1509 had succeeded to the throne, posed as a humanist, a patron of arts and letters, and was accomplished in every knightly exercise. He left the onerous task of government largely to his favourite Wolsey. But the time was to come when his passions, as violent as they were imperious, were to weigh irresistibly in the balance and dictate his policy.

(b) France had achieved unity, though with a territory not as extensive as in our own day.¹ There were still considerable remnants of the old feudal system, for the nobles and great landowners had not lost all their power, and provincial administrations were a reminder of earlier territorial divisions. The complete centralization of the government was still in the far future, but more and more people were coming to see that in the supremacy of the King lay the only hope of escape from perpetual civil war.

In 1515 Louis XII was succeeded by Francis I. His accession to the throne—long coveted and long expected—intoxicated him and his followers. So much was plain from the favours and privileges heaped upon every member of the little court of Angoulême, no less than the magnificence of the festivities held to celebrate the event. When Francis appeared in the capital, mounted on a steel-clad charger with silver housings, the spectacle excited universal admiration. He was said to be the

¹ The duchy of Brittany was not incorporated with France till 1532. The kingdom of Navarre possessed territory north of the Pyrenees in Béarn. In the Rhône valley Avignon and the Venaissin were Papal territory. Franche-Comté and the district of the Charolais, remnants of the former independent duchy of Burgundy, were held by Spain in right of its kings of the Burgundian line. Alsace was still 'Elsass', a land of the German Empire; Lorraine ('Lothringen'), a duchy of the same empire. The provinces of Artois and Flanders in the north were part of the Spanish Netherlands till the reign of Louis XIV.

handsomest prince in Europe. A young ruler, still in his twenty-first year, he was full of youthful energy, thanks to a vigorous constitution and despite the reckless excesses in which he indulged. He was tall, of commanding appearance and of a truly royal demeanour, elegant in dress, with a passion for lace and ornament, always richly clad, often in cloth of gold bright with jewels and precious stones. He had a prodigious memory and a wide range of interests that made him one of the most brilliant conversationalists of his time. He was interested in everything, and talked on every subject with equal facility—politics, the sciences, literature, and fine arts. Unfortunately, this highly talented prince never sounded the depths of any problem. The flattery with which he was overwhelmed, the spoiled child's education he had received, his weakness of character, his incapacity to resist the inclinations of his passions or to withstand the adulation of his courtiers, all contributed to make him merely frivolous, arrogant, fickle, and selfish to the core.

Two dominant motives inspired his policy—to relinquish none of the Italian ambitions which his predecessors had bequeathed to him, and to pose before Europe as the defender of the liberties of princes and cities against the excessive influence of the Emperor. The rivalry between the house of France and the house of Austria was to continue throughout the two succeeding centuries.

(c) The Empire at first sight presented the appearance of a colossal power. The union of a great part of the Burgundian inheritance and the vast estates of Austria was in itself sufficient to make the head of the house of Habsburg a powerful prince. But the union on one forehead of the Imperial Crown and the Crown of Spain, with its new possessions beyond the seas in addition to the Austro-Burgundian territories, was to give Charles V the aspect of a Lord of the World. Yet his vast dominions lacked cohesion and a central unity. He did not rule them under one title that applied to all, and in the various regions over which his sway, in one form or another, extended he had to deal with widely different conditions and conflicting

currents of opinion and tradition that in a time of far-reaching changes brought him into conflict with opposition arising from divergent sources.

(d) Spain had but lately acquired political unity, and its kingdoms had become provinces of a single State. With all their diversities of local tradition and custom, and racial characteristics, they had been drawn closely together in their long conflict with the Moor, which was counted as a crusade lasting for centuries, to save the Christian civilization of the West from Moslem domination. It gave Spain a chivalrous tradition familiar to all, popularized in a cycle of local legends and popular ballads, and permeating the ideals of Spanish literature. For many still in active life the final victory was no historic event, but a personal memory. The epoch-making year, 1492, was not in a far-off past. It had seen two events of world-wide influence —the conquest of Granada and the ocean voyage of Columbus to 'find a New World for Castille and Leon'.

That voyage had opened for the Spaniards a new period of high adventure, and the conquistadores were soon winning a new Empire beyond the ocean, which in our own day, though no longer ruled from Europe, has become for Spain an empire of goodwill with solid results in the sphere of commerce. While explorers and adventurers were seeking for material gains, the Spanish missionaries began a new period of oversea enterprise.

For Spain it was a time of manifold activities, the herald of the age which Spaniards speak of as the *siglo de oro*, the golden century. There began a new development in literature, and the rise of a characteristic school of art. Spain has only lately paid national honours to the memory of a scholar for whom it is not without reason claimed that he was the pioneer of modern international law, the Dominican Vittoria. The events of the time raised weighty questions of the rights and wrongs of discovery, conquest, and colonization, and Vittoria dealt boldly with them in a spirit that showed no narrow subservience to national and material ambitions.

When in 1519 Charles V was elected Emperor, his new dignity was not entirely a subject of pride for his Spanish

subjects. There were not a few who felt that this German honour might tend to diminish his interest in their own country, and that he might well have been contented to be ruler of Spain and the Indies, with the Netherlands and the two Sicilies for appanages of his power. The new Empire beyond the ocean seemed to be a region of untold wealth and rich promise for the future of Spain, and the energies of the young king might now be diverted to the rival interests and endless quarrels of German princelings.

The 'Emperor' was nominally the first sovereign of Christendom, the inheritor of the crown of Charlemagne, but it gave it more historic dignity than effective power. Germany was divided into a multitude of States of varying importance, jealous of their local independence and always ready to unite in combinations to limit the central imperial authority. German particularism was to favour the growth of Lutheranism, and in its turn to be favoured by it. The Diet, without which the Emperor was powerless, was a cumbrous machine, slow to move, and French diplomacy exerted itself to create in it difficulties for Charles V. His actually effective authority was limited to Austria, Styria, Carniola, and Tyrol, the inheritance of the Habsburgs. Maximilian I's matrimonial arrangements had united on the head of his second grandson, Ferdinand, the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary, and to him Charles had abandoned the task of governing that portion of his States. Ferdinand was to enjoy the full possession of them after the battle of Mohacz in 1526—in which his brother-in-law and predecessor Louis II perished at the hands of the Turks—and profit by his security to divert his attention from the rest of Europe and concentrate on the Turkish problem, always a constant issue of the first importance for eastern Europe.

Charles V was to have his attention ceaselessly divided and distracted. His policy was to try to establish his authority in Germany—to hold in check the inroads of the Turks (who, under the sovereignty of the austere and ambitious sultan, Solymán the Magnificent (1520–66), were a highly organized, ever aggressive power, a constant menace to the tranquillity

of Christendom)—and finally to maintain and consolidate his sway wherever his ancestors had ruled in Italy and in what remained of the old Burgundian dominions.

He was thus inevitably the rival of Francis I, whose opposition he had already encountered on the occasion of his election to the Empire, and whom he succeeded in ousting only with the decisive assistance of the great Augsburg banking house of Függer, who placed their enormous credit at his disposal to enable him to purchase the venal support of the electoral princes.¹

Charles was in many ways a striking contrast to his adversary, both physically and morally. He was not so tall and was less attractive in appearance, but he was as skilled in the active knightly sports of the time, as heavy an eater, as powerful a drinker, and in disposition as amorous. But his will was to a remarkable extent more deliberate, tenacious, and determined. He had been brought up under the eye of his aunt, Margaret of Austria, and surrounded by Flemings and Burgundians had learned his lesson of self-control, silence, and self-possession. He kept his head alike in triumph and disaster. He had the Faith in all sincerity of conviction and, despite the irregularities of his private life, remained a loyal Catholic. He was something of a contemplative, with an inclination to mysticism. He was reserved and not inclined to expansiveness. He showed no pity to Francis I when the fortune of battle delivered the French king into his hands.

With all these qualities and defects it must still be admitted that he possessed also the width and precision of view which distinguish real statesmen. He left nothing to chance, he planned and deliberated before proceeding to action. He was determined to be *the Emperor* in the full meaning of the word, as Charlemagne had been Emperor before him, and he regarded it as his mission to combat infidels without and heretics within. To sustain such a heavy role, he considered himself in duty

¹ The brothers, Jacob and Anton, lent him the enormous sum of 500,000 florins. The deciding factor in the election was the preference of the electors for German bills. Francis could not get credit. He tried in vain to borrow money in Genoa and Lyons, while the Augsburg merchants would not accept his bills.

bound to maintain in their integrity both all the privileges and the territories which constituted his family patrimony and all the perquisites of the Emperor as such.

Before closing this brief survey of Germany it may be well to call attention to the enormous extent of the 'ecclesiastical territories' in the Empire—States ruled by prince-bishops—and the lands of the great abbeys. Of the seven electors—the princes who chose the Emperor—three were bishops: namely, those of Mainz, Trèves, and Cologne. Besides this the Military Order of the Teutonic Knights, originally the guard of eastern Germany against the pagan Slavs of earlier times, held a large territory. Their Hohenzollern Grand Master's adherence to the Reformers was to found the future kingdom of Prussia. No country had more Church lands to tempt the spoiler to secularization than the Germany of the period with which we are dealing.

(e) Little need be said of Germany's neighbours in the out-lying northern and eastern lands of Europe. Eastwards Poland might still be reckoned as its frontier land, and in that direction, the farthest outpost of Catholic civilization and the Christendom of the West. Russia was still more Asiatic than European, and was little known to the peoples of the West. Its only port was Archangel, frozen up for half the year. Its roads were little better than sheep tracks. It was a land of few towns and cities and hundreds of wood-built villages, each living its own isolated life. The ruler of Moscow had no relations with the courts of Europe, and traders and travellers who penetrated so far spoke and wrote of his court and people as in later days explorers told of some semi-barbarous State in the heart of Asia or Africa.¹

Poland, united with Lithuania and with its territory extended eastward in the Ukraine till the Dniester was its frontier river, had become in mere extent one of the largest States of Europe, but it had a comparatively small population in most of this extensive region. It had ports on the Baltic, but its trade was

¹ See for instance in Hakluyt's *Voyages* his account of Chancellor's expedition to Archangel and Moscow in 1553. He describes it as 'the discovery of Muscovy', and Chancellor speaks of the natives of north Russia as 'the barbarians'.

largely in Jewish and German hands. Its monarchy was still hereditary in the Jagellon dynasty, but before long was to become an elected dignity. The king had limited power, for his only military force was the levies controlled by the great nobles—the voivodes, or counts palatine—amongst whom so much of the land was divided. In the Diet they were always ready to combine against him, even though they quarrelled among themselves. The bishops supported him, but there was a latent feud between them and the great nobles, whose standing grievance was that the Churchmen paid no taxes, while they paid both taxes to the Crown and tithes to the Church. The internal weakness of Poland long deprived it of any active influence on the European affairs of the times.

The three Scandinavian nations had been united in the first part of the fifteenth century. At its close Denmark still dominated the Norwegian kingdom, but had lost most of its hold on Sweden. That country was to play an important part in the later phases of the coming European crisis, and early in its development the successful resistance to a Danish attempt to reassert its overlordship in the Swedish lands largely influenced Sweden's acceptance of Lutheranism when Gustavus Vasa identified the revolt against Rome with the national movement.

(f) Italy had a special importance among European countries from the fact that Rome was the spiritual centre of Western Christendom, and still exerted a pre-eminent influence on all its peoples. But Italian nationality was still only the ideal of a few, and in fact was such a rudimentary ideal, then and for long after, that it had hardly any influence on the course of events. Italy, divided amongst many rulers, might be described as the arena of conflict for the ambitions of Spain, France, and Austria. It was still further removed from political unity than Germany. It had nothing like the Diet where the German powers assembled.

Six principal powers divided the greater part of its territory. There was the Pontifical State, in which the political power of the Popes was restricted by strong municipalities and a feudal system in ceaseless ferment; the kingdom of Naples, with a

heterogeneous population and a history of frequent revolutions, and a still vigorous feudal system, dominated since 1500 by an Aragonese dynasty so that it was practically a fief of Spain; the republic of Florence, important not so much by the extent of its territory as through its artistic, intellectual, commercial, political, and military influence. In this last the Medici had held the reins of power since Cosmo the Elder, expelled by Savonarola's revolution in 1494, had returned in 1512 with the aid of the Spaniards. The other three States of importance were Milan, Genoa, and Venice. The duchy of Milan, which had been taken and lost by Louis XII, as the heir of the Visconti, had been reconquered by Francis I, after his brilliant victory of Marignano in 1515. Charles V was to make the possession of the duchy a bone of contention with Francis I, to restore it to the Sforzas, and then take it for himself in 1535. The republic of Genoa, the rival of Venice in crusading days and still holding a prominent place in the commerce of the Mediterranean, had been subject to France since Louis XII's invasion of the Milanese territory, and was not to regain its independence till Andrea Doria liberated it in 1528. The territory of the republic of Venice, still a queen of the seas, included Istria, Dalmatia, and the Dalmatian and Ionian Islands, while it held Ravenna, Padua, Verona, Brescia, and Vicenza on the Italian mainland.

In the East the policy of Venice was mercantile and self-centred, in frequent divergence from the European tradition of resistance to the advance of the Moslem power. For the republic was largely an oligarchy of merchants. In the East it had long maintained a conciliatory attitude towards the Turks, for the sake of its trade agency at Constantinople and its representatives in the Black Sea ports. Until the first half of the sixteenth century the important trade-route to the Far East was by the caravan tracks of central Asia to Batum and Poti in Transcaucasia and Sinope in Asia Minor, and then by Constantinople and the Dardanelles. This was the 'Silk Route' between China and Europe, soon to lose its importance as the sea route round the Cape developed.

The duchy of Savoy, destined to play such a pre-eminent part in the future of Italy, was still only a French land in language and territory. It was in possession of the 'mountains', that is to say the Alpine passes, and, without prospects in France or Switzerland, Savoy tended more and more to seek expansion on the Italian side. But as yet it was only a little power, the shuttlecock of more ambitious and powerful neighbours. Apart from these States there was in Italy a multitude of small republics and sovereign lordships, coveted by their neighbours and counters to barter with when peace treaties were being negotiated.

This survey of the map of Europe would be incomplete if no mention were made of the proud and warlike people whose independence dated really from their successful struggle with Austria and Burgundy, and was completed by the final detachment of their confederation from Germany in 1513. They held their own in the heart of their mountains in the centre of Europe, and in 1517 the thirteen Cantons, each a little republic, united by the common bond of their confederacy, formed a citadel of freedom. They won fame on many battle-fields, for it was almost a national industry to provide the neighbouring princes with bands of splendid fighting men. Zwingli (1484–1531) and Calvin (1509–64) were to make Zürich and Geneva strongholds of Protestantism, but Friburg and the Cantons along the main mountain range, and south of it, including the Forest Cantons, the first founders of Swiss independence, remained true to the old Faith.

Our survey of this general situation shows four characters destined to hold the foremost places on the political stage of the time: Henry VIII and the Sultan Solyman at the wings, Francis I and Charles V in the centre. All four had in common youth, ambition, the love of glory, and military and financial power. Other rulers and States were inevitably to be drawn into their orbit.

Alongside with the picture of the diplomatic world it is important to put a picture of the social conditions of Germany in the years preceding the religious revolt.

Let us take first agricultural Germany. The last years of the fifteenth century were years of great prosperity. The land of Germany was for the most part the property of sovereign princes, but there were large tracts which were in the hands of peasant proprietors. A variety of differences of tenure existed throughout the country, but the general tendency of the times was one of movement towards greater and ever greater freedom for the cultivation of the soil. Tenants were becoming peasants; serfdom was unknown before the sixteenth century.

The conditions of their tenure were always such as to provide the tenant with adequate motive for introducing improvements in his land. This was so, as is recorded by the contemporary observer, Kantzow, even in Pomerania,¹ the most backward of all the parts of Germany, and one which, as a consequence of the later Reformation troubles, was to sink back to almost servile conditions.

The exact rights of lord and tenant were settled by the so-called 'Oracles or Manor Rights'. Conditions naturally varied from place to place, but in general the tenant was no longer *adscriptus glebae*. After having fulfilled all his obligations and given due notice, he could always leave his land, provided that he did so in 'full daylight'. 'His preparations must be made by daylight,' says the law, 'the fire must be extinguished before sunset. In the evening his goods or baggage must be put upon a wagon, the pole of which pointed in the direction in which he intended going, and then he was to be accompanied on the road by many.'²

Rents were generally moderate—in Austria, for instance, twelve days' service a year. Besides rent the tenants owed to their lord various other dues and acts in recognition of

¹ Lecce and V. Ronne, i. 17.

² *Weisthum des Hofes Prouzfeld bei Pruim*, 1476.

sovereignty, some of them of a ceremonial kind, such as the festival of Langenburg, where at Whitsuntide the tenants had to come and dance before the lord, who entertained them with cakes and beer.

It was the duty of the lord to support his tenants while they were performing their feudal services, and every place had its own customs as to the details of food and wine which the lord should provide.

Besides the taxes which were brought by the tenant to the lord there were others which were 'collectable' by the lord's agent from the tenant. It is incredible to see the tiny detail by which the tenant was guaranteed lest any advantage be taken of this intrusion. 'The baby in the cradle', it is laid down, 'must not be wakened nor the fowl on the nest frightened. Should the tenant's wife be in childbirth, the agent must take only the head of the fowl and leave the body for the invalid. He must not bring spurs or sword into the house so as not to frighten the wife.'¹

There were, of course, punishments should the tenant fail to pay his dues, the extreme punishment being eviction, but the law recommended mercy 'to the poor in particular'.²

There was naturally a great variety of settlements throughout the country—the isolated farms of Pomerania, the scattered groups of farms of the mountainous southern districts, the closely packed villages of the Rhineland. But wherever there was a village, there was a village 'mark' or common land, which the villagers could use for the grazing of their cattle. The villager possessed, too, the privilege of the 'acorning', that is of turning his animals into the woods to forage for acorns. The inhabitants of the village who were not engaged in agriculture might use the village mark along with the rest, but under conditions. Travellers, also, might use it for a limited time, and the animals of a traveller were cared for by the village through which he passed. The boundaries of the village were jealously guarded, and periodically all the inhabitants of the village went in procession round them, the parish priest leading. Hymns were sung,

¹ *Manor Laws of Menchinger*. Grimm, *Rechtsalterthümer*, 395.

² *Manor Laws of Walmersheim*.

and at various places on the way a halt called and prayers said for prosperity.

The village enjoyed large powers of local self-government, electing its own mayor and judge and other officials. It was the business of the elected authorities to decide what crops should be sown on such and such a field every year and which fields should be allowed to lie fallow. They also sanctioned or forbade the cutting down of trees. The forest laws, on the other hand, being framed for the preservation of game, were made and enforced by the lord.

Perhaps the most vivid of all the descriptions of the peasant life of Germany at the turn of the century is that found in the regulations of Nicholas Engelman, who was head-steward for the archbishop of Mainz of the domain of Erfurt from 1495 to 1516. There we find a complete description of the duties of all those employed about the estate, an inventory of the building and the tools, a description of the 'three-year succession' system by which the land was worked, of the methods to be used in the meadows and in the vineyards. He also shows how large was the part which religion was made to play in the life of the estate. The kitchen-master must himself set a good example. 'The kitchen-master', writes Engelman, 'must go to church every day, hear Mass, and say before the people five Paters and Aves in honour of the wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ.' The example which the master was to give, subordinates were to follow. A book similar to that of Engelman, from Königsbrück, near Selz, says: 'Each servant shall hear the entire Mass and sermon every Sunday and holy day. . . . Whoever without permission shall not hear the Mass and sermon shall be deprived of meat at lunch.' And again, 'When the Angelus is rung the steward shall call the servants to prayer, and whoever disobeys shall be punished.'

There was no complete divorce between town and country life. For the towns themselves owned extensive lands outside their own boundaries, while the invasion of towns by the avocations of the country can be seen from such quaint laws as that of Frankfort-on-the-Main, which forbade pigsties to be built

facing on the public street, or of Nuremberg, which forbade the pigs actually to run in the streets.

Bees, also, were kept in large numbers, and continued to be so until the abolition of altar-candles by the Calvinists brought about a decline in the demand for wax.¹ Gardens were many and beautiful, Erfurt being especially famous in this respect.² The vine was cultivated far more extensively than is the case to-day. There is abundant evidence that, owing to the popularity of agricultural work, food and drink were, at any rate up till the end of the fifteenth century, exceedingly plentiful, far more so than they have ever been again. ‘The day-labourer’, says the *Book of Fruit and Grain*, a contemporary work, ‘always drank wine twice a day, as he ate meat twice a day.’ Henry Muller, writing in 1500, just after things had taken a turn for the worse, says: ‘They (the peasants) had an abundance of meat every day; on festival and fair days the table was loaded with all that was good. Wine was drunk like water; every one ate and took as much as he wished, so great was the prosperity that prevailed.’ Day-labourers were in general even better off than the peasants.

Thus from 1455 to 1480 in Saxony the average price of a pair of shoes was 2 to 3 groschen, a fowl $\frac{1}{2}$ a groschen, a yard of cloth 5 groschen, a bushel of rye 6 groschen. At the same time a day-labourer’s weekly wages came to from 6 to 8 groschen. In Bayreuth in 1468 labourers received 18 pence a day, while the best beef cost 2d. a pound and sausage a penny. Other figures from other parts tell a similar tale.

Let us see how they ate. In the regulations laid down in 1497 by the archbishop of Mainz for the people on his estate he says: ‘In the morning soup and bread; for lunch at mid-day a strong soup, good meat, vegetables, and half a jug of ordinary wine; in the evening a strong soup or meat and bread.’ The dukes of Saxony in 1482 gave orders concerning the labourers whom they employed: ‘Besides their wages, they shall have twice a day, for dinner and supper, four dishes: soup, two kinds of meat and

¹ *Abhandlung über Bienenrecht des Mittelalters*, Nordlingen, 1865, p. 47.

² Langethal, iii. 121–2.

one vegetable. On feast days five dishes: soup, two kinds of fish and two vegetables.'

The standard of living was in these years as high, in the other countries of Europe—in Italy, France, and England—as it was in Germany. ‘The fifteenth century and the early years of the sixteenth were the Golden Age of the English husbandmen, the artisan, and the labourer’, writes Thorold Rogers in his *History of Agriculture and Prices*,¹ and ‘before the Reformation wine was abundant, cheap, and freely used. Afterwards it became an occasional luxury. The enjoyments of the middle class were stinted, and even those of the more wealthy were few.’² With the sixteenth century came the decline in the standard of living, and, hand in hand with that decline, the attempt, largely successful, to drive the tenant and servant classes back from free to forced labour. This was one of the causes of the peasants revolt.

Yet the artisan played on the whole a more important part in the life of sixteenth-century Germany than the peasant. The system of organization under which he lived his life he could trace back to Charlemagne, by whom the first regulations for the conditions of life in the mines and the tanneries were laid down. Throughout the Middle Ages it was the monasteries and the bishops who were the chief patrons of architectural and industrial progress, and it was the bishops who were responsible for the revival of the old Roman towns. With hardly an exception the cities of medieval Germany which rose into importance were the seats of bishops and owed their importance in the first place to that fact.

Each city in the German system was a self-contained, and, in most respects, a self-governing unit. A man’s city was, as it were, his larger family. Within the city each industry was organized into its particular guild—the linen-workers, the wool-workers, the dyers, the iron-smiths, the various people whom we should to-day call provision-merchants and so on—but while the guild regulated the conditions of work within the industry,

¹ Oxford, 1882, vol. iv, p. 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 100.

the guilds themselves were subject to the town council, which had a power of veto over the regulations of the guilds if they should in any way contravene the general welfare. A similar organization prevailed among the 'brotherhoods' of miners, for Germany was the great mining country of Europe at the time.¹

In addition to regulating conditions of labour the guilds undertook a general responsibility for the morals of their members. The members were bound, as a copy of guild rules shows, not only 'to show a brotherly love and loyalty to *each other* through life' but also 'to all citizens and wherever occasion demanded it of them'. Each guild had its patron saint, whom in most cases tradition averred to have practised its particular craft, and on his or her feast-day all the members went to hear Mass together. The guild also commanded all its members to obey the law of the Church by hearing Mass every Sunday and day of obligation.

In addition the members of the guild were obliged to help one another in the event of illness or bereavement or other misfortune. In return the guild had the right to concern itself with the reputation of its members or with the candidates for its membership. No one was to be admitted who was not of legitimate birth. Idleness, drunkenness, sexual immorality among the members could be punished by the officers of the guild.

In the first place it was the business of the guild to fix the price at which the commodity which it produced should be put on the market. It is true that the town council had the right, if necessary, to veto this price and fix another of its own, but it was considered a point of honour for the guild itself to fix a fair price and a disgrace if the town council's interference was necessary. Only those who really worked were admitted as members. The bad customs of the years before the French Revolution, by which guildsmen did not work themselves but merely used their privileged position to tax those who did wish to do so, were the product of corrupter times and would have been impossible before the Reformation. In addition to regulating

¹ See H. Achenbach, *Gemeines deutsches Bergrecht*, i. 69, 109.

prices it was the business of the guild to regulate wages and hours of labour and to purchase communally the raw material which their particular industry required. It also undertook the task of seeing that none of its members put on the market goods of a false quality, and of punishing any whom it found to be doing so. The punishments were sometimes quaint, but doubtless effective. For instance, in Vienna, Ratisbon, and Zürich dishonest bakers were put in a basket and dipped in a puddle. It was only in the sixteenth century that the guilds became narrowly exclusive in the admission of new members.

Each guild was under the rulership of a guild director, whose duty it was to preserve friendly relations with other guilds. Besides the members proper each guild had its associates, that is, the wives, children, and other dependants—for whom the guild assumed responsibility, even though they were not members. Members also had their apprentices, the relations between apprentice and master constantly being compared to those between son and father. At the conclusion of his apprenticeship the apprentice had, if he wished, the right to repudiate his obligations and declare himself a journeyman.

Apart from the guilds were the workmen's clubs, which continued to flourish in spite of efforts to suppress them, owing both their strength and their unpopularity to the fact that they were international. These workmen's clubs had, like the guilds, their feasts and their mutual benefit schemes. Sometimes their relations with the masters were friendly, at other times not so. There are records of strikes of bakers, tinsmiths, tailors, watermen, at different places in Germany at the end of the fifteenth century. Yet wages on the whole were good—20 deniers a day in summer, for instance, 16 in winter for a carpenter or mason, when beef cost 2 deniers a pound—and evidence and denunciation of their luxury is frequent.

Baths, contrary to general belief, were extremely common. In the city of Lübeck from the thirteenth century onwards there was a bathroom in almost every street, in Ulm 11 public bath-houses, in Nuremberg 12, in Frankfort 15, in Vienna 29. Charitable persons left money in their wills for baths—‘soul-

baths', as they were quaintly called. Private baths, too, were not at all uncommon, probably much more common than they were in England until quite recently.

The ambition of the artisan was to become a 'master' at his trade. Society did not, it is true, envisage his rising out of his trade altogether. His life was a life of status, and no pretence was made of dazzling the errand-boy with the promise that one day he might become a millionaire. It was thought that the happiest society was one in which people were content with the limited ambition of doing their work well and with the state of life into which it had pleased God to call them.

Besides the guilds of manufacturers were the guilds of merchants. As has been said, the city was the medieval German's larger family, and the manufacturer fitted into that medieval scheme as completely as the peasant. He was of one place and no other. It is a valid criticism of that system that it never completely and satisfactorily provided a place for the merchant —for the man whose life was not confined to one place, but of the essence of whose life it was that he had different interests in different places.

The traders of one city, or nation, resident in a foreign city bound themselves together into Hanse, or guilds. At first each German city had its own Hansa in each foreign trading capital, but in course of time the conveniences of a strong organization were preferred to the glow of civic pride, and all the German merchants in each town came to band themselves together into a single Hansa, and even all the German merchants in a country came in course of time to unite. Thus in England all German merchants were affiliated to the Hansa of London, in Russia to that of Novgorod, and so on. From that in time grew the still greater unit of 'the Society of German Merchants of the Holy Roman Empire', the general German 'Hansa'.

The Hanseatic League was formed to represent all German merchants in all foreign countries. The imperial authorities had no direct control over its policy, yet it remained always loyal to the Empire. The fifteenth century was the century of its highest power, and of the Hanseatic cities the first and most

important was Danzig, its next rival on the coast perhaps Lübeck. Breslau, Cologne, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Ulm, and Strasburg were the most important inland Hanseatic towns.

Among the most important of the Hanseatic possessions were naturally their fleets. The Danzig vessels varied from 40 to 1,900 tons, and the largest, such as the *Peter von Danzig*, sometimes carried as many as 400 sailors. They were equipped for defence as well as for trade. On board ship the strictest discipline was maintained. As soon as they had left port, the captain called together sailors and passengers and they elected a bailiff, four officers, and a judge. These elected persons had very full disciplinary powers over all the other passengers for the duration of the voyage. Just before port was reached, another meeting of those on board was called, and the bailiff and his colleagues solemnly resigned the authority which had been conferred upon them.

Trade naturally carried the German merchant into every country of Europe—westward into France, eastward to Russia, north to the Baltic, overseas to England. A regular postal service kept up communication between the traveller and his head-quarters at home.¹ Yet by far the most important trade-route was that which went south up the Rhine and over the passes of the Alps to Venice, the port for the merchandise of the Eastern world.

All the great German merchant houses, such as the Fuggers, had their branches at Venice, and it was a common part of the training of the young merchant that he should be sent to learn the ways of the commercial world by serving a term in the firm's Venetian house.

On the other hand, while the German merchant was going abroad, the foreign merchant was naturally enough pushing his way into Germany. The road from Venice to the Rhine was trodden in both directions. The greatest occasion in the year for the gathering of foreign merchants was that of the Frankfort fair. 'Merchants from the Netherlands, Flanders, England, Poland, Bohemia, Italy, and France,' writes Jerome Munzer

¹ See Flegler, *Zur Gesch. der Posten*.

in 1495, 'come to the Frankfort fair and do a large business.' The citizens of Frankfort, whose prosperity depended upon the success of the fair, organized escorts of arquebusiers for the foreign merchants who came to visit it with their wares.

It is a commonplace that it was the discovery of the Cape route to India which was among the chief causes of the decline of Venice from the sixteenth century onwards. That discovery shifted the whole centre of Europe's commercial gravity westward, and the Rhineland cities were the sufferers from it in a degree only less than Venice. Yet their loss was not immediate. For, though there seemed no compelling geographical reason why it should be so, the houses of Augsburg, the Welsers, and others had established themselves at Lisbon, and in the early years of Portuguese discovery received from the Portuguese kings considerable privileges both as regards Indian and as regards Brazilian trade.

There is abundant evidence of the prosperity of the German merchant in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. In 1438 the Russian metropolitan passed through Germany on his way to the council of Florence. He was completely amazed 'at the prosperity of all he saw'. In 1458 the Italian Aeneas Sylvius found the same story. 'Germany has never been richer or more prosperous than to-day.... God has favoured this land beyond others,' he wrote. Fifty years later again, Jacob Wimpfeling still writes, 'Germany was never more prosperous than she is in our day'.

Yet it is in Wimpfeling's narrative that we find the first traces of a new attitude. Material prosperity is noted, but it is no longer noted entirely as a matter for congratulation.

Radix malorum est cupiditas,

as Chaucer quoted in England a hundred years before. 'Wealth and prosperity are attended with great dangers, as we see daily exemplified',¹ says Wimpfeling, and there follows a denunciation of the evils of luxury and too great riches, following the familiar lines which such denunciations have followed throughout the ages. Extravagance of dress was the especial vice of the

¹ *De Arte Impressoria.*

German merchant classes, and in 1485 the Council of Ratisbon had attempted to curb this extravagance by sumptuary regulations which met with no more success than such regulations usually do. 'The authorities ought to forbid the abominable show dresses which are worn', demands Geiler von Kaisersberg, like a twentieth-century town councillor, and the developments of the times are clearly shown by a popular song of the day,

Die Weiber sind mit veh beschnitten,
Gezieret wol nach edlen sitten,
Wer kann sie unterscheiden?

'The women now are clothed in fur, they are dressed in nobles' robes—who can tell the difference?' 'They paint themselves many times in the day, and have false teeth and hair', complains Heiler of the women. The men, not unlike some men to-day, were apparently determined to rival the other sex. For he turns from the women to young fops, 'who perfume themselves with rose-water and use cosmetics'. 'They paint themselves with monkey-grease', complains Sebastian Brant in the *Narrenschiff*. 'See the trousers,' says Geiler, 'they are divided off like a chess-board.' It was a familiar complaint against the German of the sixteenth century, as Shakespeare in the *Merchant of Venice* shows it to be a familiar complaint against the Englishman of James I's time, that he was the ready victim of every foolish foreign fashion in dress which came his way.

It was the merchants who set the fashions in luxury, and the foolish pride of the poorer nobles, ashamed lest they be left behind, which brought Germany to her troubles. For all over Germany the sixteenth century saw noble after noble living beyond his income, falling into debt and into the clutches of the Jews. The Church thundered against usury, but, when the impoverished noble was determined to have money at any price and the lender would only lend at usurious rates, the regulations of the Church could not prevent two parties doing business when both were determined that business should be done. Besides, there was no such thing as an imperial coinage, and, that being so, an irresistibly large part in social life was played

by the money-changer. Money-changing and money-lending are two professions that are easily compatible with one another.

Yet the prohibitions of the Church, though they could not prevent the Christian from doing business with the Jew, could yet make certain that he hated the Jew after he had done business with him. Unpopularity grew like a snowball. The more that the Jew was hated, the greater was the chance that he would never see his money back. The greater that chance, the higher the rate of interest which he charged, and the higher the rate of interest, the more again was he hated. As a result a regular and wearisome cycle—first, astonishingly high rates of interest, for instance, 86½ per cent. per annum, in Vienna; then, expulsion of the Jews, from city after city, and then after a time recall by those who desperately needed money whatever the interest, and who found that if they could not get it from the Jews, they could not get it from any one.¹ The final result was deep mutual contempt of each race for the other, and preachers, especially Dominicans, were eloquent to point out the moral superiority of the producer over him who made his living out of merely taking advantage of others' necessities.

There was clearly but one solution—the establishment of regular banks and of non-Jewish money-lenders—and this was tried, but it was not altogether a success. It was soon found that greed was the consequence not so much of race as of opportunity, and complaints were loud that the Christian money-lender was worse than the Jew. The trading-companies which sprang up were no philanthropic institutions, and the vile habit of 'cornering' some necessity of life and reselling to the public at grossly excessive prices begins to be practised with increasing frequency. Christopher Kuppner writes in 1508 that 'when they learn that any particular article of trade has gone up in price, whether it be saffron, pepper corn, or what not, [they] instantly buy it all up to sell at whatever price they please'. 'They commit unpunished', complains Kilian Lieb, 'within the city walls and their own houses deeds which in former days robbers only dared at the risk of their lives.' 'Greater extor-

¹ See *Lettres de Pierre de Froissart*.

tioners and deceivers of the people than even the Jews had been', Geiler von Kaisersberg calls them.

The Diet of Cologne in 1512 attempted to lay down regulations which would control the activities and extortions of the trading-companies. But money was powerful and corruption rife, and it was easier to lay down such regulations than to find officers to enforce them. The sixteenth century saw the growth of trading monopolies, of what modern language would call 'trusts' and of 'cornerings' of the market. The attempts to break trusts on the whole ended in failure. Immense fortunes were made by such people as the Fuggers, of whom their secretary Conrad Meyer wrote, 'The capital of the Fuggers at one period received an increase of 13,000,000 florins in the course of seven years.'¹ Accusations of dishonesty and of the presentation of fraudulent accounts by directors were frequently heard.

The theologians did not at all neglect their duty of expounding to the faithful the Church's teaching on the rights of property and of pointing out that a defence of those rights did not at all imply a blind defence of every method of acquisition or of squandering which the rich might chance to devise. *Bona temporalia, quae homini divinitus conferuntur, eius quidem sunt quantum ad proprietatem sed quantum ad usum non solum debent esse eius, sed etiam aliorum, qui ex eis sustentari possunt ex eo quod ei superfluit*, they were for ever quoting from St. Thomas Aquinas.² The teaching of the Church and the teaching of German jurisprudence were at one on the duties and the rights of property and on the necessity and the dignity of labour, and those who attempted to live without work were denounced by such writers as Heinrich von Langerstein for attempting to shirk the yoke which God had placed upon fallen man as punishment for Adam's sin. Agriculture, he argued, was the noblest of callings, then manufacture, for the manufacturer at least made something. Commerce was the meanest and least blessed.

Christian writers who denounced the corrupting influences

¹ Greiff, p. 99.

² Contzen's *Geschichte der volkswirthschaft. Litteratur*, 84.

of trade were in no want for authorities to quote, whether in pagan antiquity, among the fathers, or among the schoolmen from St. Thomas onwards. Nor did those who quarrelled most bitterly with scholastic philosophy quarrel with it on that score. Erasmus, for instance, wrote that 'Merchants are the vilest and most contemptible of men'.

The only kind of lending on 'interest' which the Church permitted was Rentenkauf, or the imposition on a piece of land belonging to a debtor of a tax or annual interest. And lending-houses were established with the intention of driving the usurious money-lender out of business. They were ineffective. As ineffective was the attempt to enforce the fixed price for articles of commerce, though writers like Trithemius argued convincingly upon its advantages.

The truth was that, while artisan and agricultural Germany both on the whole held to the older and healthier medieval ways, commercial Germany had broken with the restrictions of medievalism. The convenient doctrine of Roman law that the rights of property were absolute was eagerly seized upon by the rich to give theoretical justification to their conduct, and the Germany into which Luther was born was a Germany which in this respect, if not in others, had already outgrown the teaching which had made it.¹

¹ This section is based throughout on Janssen's *History of the German People*, Book III.

PART I

THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION

CHAPTER I

LUTHER AND ZWINGLI

Summary: 1. The youth of Luther. 2. The Indulgence Controversy. 3. The impotence of the Emperor, birth of a Protestant Church. 4. Huldreich Zwingli. 5. Zwinglianism.

I. THE YOUTH OF LUTHER

PROOF of the extent to which revolution was, so to speak, 'in the air' in the beginning of the sixteenth century may be found in the fact that it broke out almost simultaneously in Saxony under Luther and in Switzerland under Zwingli without it being possible to say with certainty that either of the two 'reformers' had any considerable influence on the other. Luther was only a few months older than his Swiss rival. He rebelled against Rome a little earlier than Zwingli and set him the example. The movement which he inaugurated had far-reaching consequences and through force of circumstances became widespread. The story of the Protestant Revolution may therefore properly begin with a sketch of Luther's life, his influence, his achievement.

He was born in Eisleben, a small town in Saxony, on the 10th November 1483, the same year as Raphael Sanzio. His parents were of humble peasant stock, vigorous and hardy, like most peasant folk, especially in that district. Hans Luther, the father, was employed in the copper mines in the neighbourhood of Moehra. Six months after the birth of little Martin—the Christian name of the future Reformer (St. Martin's Day falls on the 11th November)—the family moved to Mansfeld. Luther's childhood was bleak and gloomy. Margaret Ziegler, his mother, was not lavish of affection, and she often punished his childish faults severely. He would seem to have derived from the grim and joyless environment in which he was brought up, the merciless punishments to which he was subjected, the

examples of boorish rigour which he had constantly before his eyes, and the exacting discipline which under the harsh control of Hans Luther prevailed in the home, a tendency to consider himself as the victim of a pitiless fate, a sense of domination by the mysterious omnipotence of God; he combined with this tendency an ever-present readiness to invoke the powers of the political order which was destined to exercise a decisive influence on the progress of the 'Reformation'. He was, moreover, and this strain he probably inherited from his peasant ancestors, of an impetuous character, gifted with a ferocious and dogged energy, naturally impressionable and impulsive, prone to coarse frivolity and vulgarity of language, whether in speech or writing—qualities to be found in most of his writings, but especially abundant in his famous 'Table-talk'.

He was one of those vigorous ebullient characters which find it difficult not to take sides when confronted with the problems of life, but not infrequently spend themselves to excess and without adequate reflection in whatever course of conduct is suggested to them by changing circumstance.

While yet a child he evinced a marked aptitude for study. After attending the elementary school at Mansfeld, he was sent at the age of fourteen to Magdeburg, and the following year to St. George's High School at Eisenach. There he sang in the streets (a custom common enough with the poor scholars of the time), begging his bread 'for the love of God'. Ursula Cotta, a lady in the town, charmed with his voice and manners, adopted him after a fashion and took him to live in her house. In this pious widow's home he tasted for the first time in his life the sweetness of affection. In due course he reached the university, the mighty power which dispensed careers 'with a future'. His father was proud of him and decided that he should study law. Were not jurists at the time the counsellors of kings and princes, the rivals in influence and riches of the clergy—even though laymen?

Martin Luther entered his name on the matriculation roll of the flourishing university of Erfurt for the summer session of 1501. The philosophy he was taught in the Faculty of Arts in

scholastic Latin did not deal with fundamental and important truths, but consisted rather of pretentious and pedantic discussions of minutiae and the drawing of perversely subtle and petty verbal distinctions. The result was to produce in the pupil's mind a disbelief in the importance of reason of which Luther was never able to free himself entirely, although he very quickly repudiated the teachers of his youth. He made no contacts with the humanists, although they had a distinguished representative in Erfurt itself in the person of Canon Conrad Mutti (Mutianus Rufus), who having studied in Italy had brought back with him the anti-Christian ideas professed with prudent cynicism by the devotees of pagan antiquity. Luther staunchly adhered to the faith of his ancestors. The enthusiasms of the Renaissance were never destined seriously to affect his mind.

University successes rewarded his diligent application. He took his degree of Master of Arts in 1505, second in a list of seventeen successful candidates. He heard his friends predict for him a glorious career. He himself describes how, in 1530, a man whom he was trying to console for the death of his son, said to him: 'You'll see, Martin, you'll live to be a great man!'¹

This praise he long remembered—an indication that it had impressed him deeply. He had just begun to study law in the summer session of 1505, and his father, counting upon his hopes being soon realized, had bought him a *Corpus Juris*, when the course of his life was suddenly changed. On the 2nd July 1505, as he was returning home from a journey, he encountered a violent storm at Stotternheim, just outside Erfurt. The thunderclaps and lurid lightning-flashes terrified him. He took them for portentous signs of the wrath of God in his regard. 'St. Anne,' he exclaimed, 'help me! I will become a monk.' A friend was later to compare him to St. Paul stricken on the road to Damascus. He himself besought his father, in whose character was a strong trait of contentious anticlericalism, to forgive him for adopting the monastic life without his knowledge and against his will, alleging that he had been summoned

¹ Letter to Jerome Weller, Enders, viii, 160.

thereto 'by a terror come from Heaven' and that he had then taken a vow 'constrained and coerced'.¹

On the 17th July 1505 Martin Luther without further reflection entered the monastery of the Augustinians at Erfurt. He was a postulant for a few weeks: a novice for a year: he took his solemn vows in September 1506.

We have Luther's own testimony that in the early days of his monastic life he was afflicted and overwhelmed by an ineradicable melancholy. The thought of the judgements of God seems to have haunted him day and night. He often took Dr. Staupitz, the Vicar-General of the Order and his Superior, into his confidence—he retained to the end of his life the most grateful recollection of his advice—and confided in him 'the awful terrifying thoughts' which unceasingly obsessed him. He was greatly strengthened and comforted on hearing the worthy Superior tell him: 'Martin, you cannot realize how beneficent and necessary such a temptation is to you. It is not for nothing that God is trying you so. You will see that He will use you as His instrument for some great purpose!' Compliments and encouragements of this sort were balm to his soul, at any rate for a time. His mind was sensitive and impressionable to the highest degree. In the letter written in 1530 in which he gives us these particulars, he admits that at the time he was continuously assailed by temptations to despair and that to defy and repel the devil who wanted to torment and tease him, he liked 'to drink more copiously, to talk more freely, to eat more often'.² Although at the first he made an honest attempt to live up to the obligations which he had undertaken, it was clear even then that the life was not one to which he was suited. Prayer he found 'wearisome and annoying'. He suffered from 'temptations of the flesh, the devil, and the world', and followed

¹ Cf. Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel*, ii. 208. 'Table-talk', Weimar, iv, no. 4707—Weimar, *Lutherswerke*, viii. 573–4. Doubts have been thrown on the story of Luther being scared by a thunderstorm into becoming a monk. Luther himself said later that his life had been so unhappy that he went to the cloister in the hope of finding things better there. This, however, does not necessarily negative the storm tradition. He may have been thinking of taking refuge in the monastery when he was scared into a decision.

² Enders, viii. 160.

'ways of his own' for which he earned what he himself admitted to be the just rebuke of his superiors.¹

Luther was ordained priest early in 1507 and celebrated his first Mass on the 2nd May with profound sentiments of humility and piety. Once his novitiate was over, he had to begin his theological studies. Such philosophical education as he had received as a layman was considered adequate. It is none the less surprising, however, that after a course of at most two years' theology he should have been transferred from the monastery at Erfurt to the university of Wittenberg as a professor (1508). Such swift promotion was bound to lead to disastrous consequences. Luther found himself at the age of twenty-five thrown on his own resources, with no one to direct his mind, in a very young university, founded in 1502, whose statutes dated only from the year 1508, the very year in which he made his entry. The youthful professor at once caused a sensation in the little town of two or three thousand inhabitants and in the society without roots or traditions in which he found himself. His first sojourn at Wittenberg, however, was not of long duration. He was recalled to Erfurt at the end of October 1509. A year later he made the journey to Rome at the expense of his community.

The journey lasted five months. It has often been said that his residence in the city of the Popes contributed to detach him from Roman unity. There is nothing in contemporary record to prove it. The story of his suddenly discovering the doctrine of justification by faith, which he afterwards preached, while ascending the Scala Santa, may be traced to an autograph insertion made by his son Paul after Luther's death, in a Bible now in the possession of the library of Rudolstadt. Luther nowhere alludes to it.² On the other hand, it is very probable that Luther became more intimately acquainted in the course of his journey with the peculiarly Augustinian doctrines which he must have known already in a summary fashion, but which the Italian theologians of his Order, such as Giles of Viterbo,

¹ See Janssen's *History of the German People*, English translation by Christie, vol. iii, p. 83.

² See Boehmer, *Luther im Lichte der Neueren Forschung*, Leipzig, 1906, p. 27; Hausrath, *Martin Luther's Romfahrt*, Berlin, 1894.

his Superior-General, professed in a manner which must have made an irresistible appeal to him, and the prevalence of which was later proved by the career of Girolamo Seripando and the part which that theologian played at the Council of Trent.

It is familiar knowledge that, ever since the dispute between the British monk Pelagius and his immortal adversary St. Augustine, one of the great controversial questions of Western theology was the problem of salvation, justification, grace, and predestination. Various schools of thought with regard to this great question had grown up in the Church. The Nominalists argued that the human will was all important, the Augustinians said grace, while the Thomists held an intermediate position. Luther had imbibed the milk of Nominalism in philosophy. But he was powerfully predisposed by nature, temperament, and intimate experience to adhere to Augustinian doctrines. The idea that God is the author of everything in us, that salvation is a pure grace, that we are powerless for good and ineluctably bound to evil, took firm root in his mind. The conversations he listened to, the instruction he received, the devotional and consolatory books he read in his Order emancipated him from the purely intellectual Nominalism he had learned from his teachers in Erfurt. He was strongly inclined towards theories of pessimism which maintained that evil was ineradicably rooted in the heart of man. It was long believed on the testimony of Luther himself that he derived his theory of justification from St. Augustine. The truth is, as we shall see, that he differed from the great doctor in essential points and that he was aware of it. His terminology, however, was adapted from the Augustinian theologians. His journey to Rome may therefore have exercised a decisive influence upon him in the way of turning towards theories which he was to make his own, to stamp with his seal, after having fashioned them in accordance with the personal drift of his own feelings and experiences.¹

¹ Cf. the article by Pasquier in the *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, s.v. 'Luther', cols. 1203-5. The author admits that Seripando, then aged 17, met Luther in Rome. H. Jedin has recently shown that the event is in the highest degree probable by proving from the Augustinian archives in Rome that during his stay in the Eternal City, Luther must have lodged, not as had been hitherto admitted (notably by Böhmer, *Luthers*

This much is certain that Luther abandoned the Observants, who had sent him to Rome to plead their cause and serve their interests, and then began to ridicule 'the little saints of works, the justifiers'.

He was back at Wittenberg in the summer of 1511, there to remain for most of his life. He became Professor of Holy Scripture. He devoted himself whole-heartedly to the theology which was beginning to be called *positive* so as to distinguish it from scholastic theology. He obtained his degree and cap of Doctor of Theology on the 18th October 1512, after a brilliant examination.

From the latter half of 1513 until the month of April 1515 he lectured on the Psalms, and from April 1515 until October 1516 he expounded the Epistle to the Romans. He was once more busy with the problem of justification. What part can man play in that essential work? How can we overcome the passions which assail us? How are we to fulfil the will of God as expressed in the commandments He imposes on us? What is the meaning of the opposition we feel within ourselves between the flesh and the spirit, between the ideal we cherish in our hearts and the sad reality of our lives? Such were the questions he asked himself in anguish. He had already written in 1514 in his *Commentary on the Psalms*:

Man realizes that he is frail and of no account, when he tries to do what he can in the conviction that he can because he knows how. The passion of anger, pride, lechery is considered easy to overcome, from afar off and by people without experience. But near at hand, it is found to be extremely difficult, *nay insurmountable such is the teaching of experience*¹

Luther was feeling his way to his theory of invincible concupiscence. Once he had made such a theory his own the paradox he had to solve was that the sinner could be justified only if he fulfilled the law, and yet the fulfilment of the law (*Romfahrt* and *Der Junge Luther*), at Santa Maria del Popolo, but at Sant' Agostino, where his Superior-General, Giles of Viterbo, and the latter's young pupil, Seripando, resided. Cf *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xxv 265 et seq. (1928).

¹ Otto Scheel has collected the texts on this point in *Dokumente zu Luthers Entwicklung* cf no 200, p 87

was beyond his powers. When he came to deal with the Epistle to the Romans, the young doctor thought he had discovered the solution he had been looking for. We fulfil the law through Christ. Left to ourselves, we are sinners beyond hope of salvation. But He is justice incarnate. He has redeemed us. God 'imputes' to us His justice. Justification therefore is wholly exterior. We continue to be sinners, but God covers us with the mantle of the merits of His Son. The means we have of making our own the sanctity of Christ is Faith taken in the sense of mistrust of ourselves and confidence in Jesus Christ alone. Once this is accepted we can and we ought to say that we are justified by faith without good works.

From 1515 onwards, this doctrine became fixed in his mind. He never, indeed, possessed any ordered and coherent system. He had not the genius for clear disposition and co-ordination which Calvin possessed. But such as it was, his doctrine can be reduced to the few following points.

(i) *Original Sin.* Luther defines it by interpreting the text of St Paul in the Epistle to the Romans in the light and under the compulsion of his own temptations, lapses, fits of remorse and scruples '*Original sin is the lack of all rectitude and energy in our physical and mental faculties, both exterior and interior, the inclination to evil, disgust with the good, weariness of illumination and wisdom, the love of error and darkness, avoidance and detestation of good works, zeal in wrong-doing.*'¹ Original sin, in other words, is concupiscence. It is ineradicable and indestructible. It vitiates all our acts. We commit a mortal sin in every act we perform, even in our acts of loving God, for our corrupt nature can achieve only corrupt acts.

Salvation by good works is therefore an absurdity.

(ii) *Predestination.* God saves whomsoever He pleases, by His irresistible will. We all alike deserve eternal death. But God selects out of the multitude of those thus doomed those whom he destines for Paradise. That is predestination and it is fatalistic and inevitable. All who are not elected fall into Hell. 'Through His will which is immutable, eternal, and indefectible',

¹ Otto Scheel, op. cit., p. 121.

writes Luther in his treatise *On the Bondage of the Will* which dates from 1525, 'God foresees, foretells, and realizes all things. This principle is like a lightning flash, blasting and destroying human freedom absolutely.'¹

(iii) *The means to Salvation: the Law and the Promise.* God might, without more ado, open the gates of Heaven to His elect and hurl His victims into Hell, but it pleases Him in a way to mask His plan. God appears to Luther like the father of a family issuing orders without having to furnish his reasons. Children are not argued with. they are compelled to obey Such is God's attitude to His creatures Therefore He imposes conditions of salvation, although it is beyond the power of man to fulfil them. He imposes the Law on him. Hitherto it had been believed that the Law had been introduced for the purpose of being fulfilled. That is an error: its sole object is to drive us to despair. No man can keep the law It overwhelms us, dooms us, leads us to the brink of the abyss, shows us our appointed place in Hell. We must resign ourselves to the eternal punishment we have deserved. Suddenly at the very moment when we are about to sink in despair, when all our self-confidence has vanished, God flashes before our eyes the consoling Promise. The Promise comes from the Gospel, is the essence of the Gospel. The Promise is the work of Jesus Christ Who suffered for our sakes and gives us the tender assurance of our salvation, our forgiveness, our redemption in His blood. If we have *faith* in this Promise, we are saved. This is described as the dogma of justification by faith without good works.

Luther had elaborated and accepted this doctrine whole and entire as early as 1515. but then he still maintained that man could not be certain of his salvation, and that the sense of 'security' would bring with it, in his case, a train of grave disorders He was to combat Indulgences precisely because of the danger which the illusive sense of 'security' provoked. He was, however, before long to come to the conclusion that *faith* was not solid if there was any hesitation to believe that Jesus has atoned for us, that doubts concerning salvation were

¹ *De Servo Arbitrio*, Weimar, xviii. 616 et seq.

necessarily excluded by the conviction that Jesus is good and forgives us our trespasses, and he was to make justifying faith consist in the conviction of unconditional salvation. This discovery we attribute to the year 1518, for Luther was not yet in full possession of it when he began his campaign against Indulgences, but he expressly maintained it in his subsequent debate with the Legate Cajetan (Cardinal Tommaso de Vio) at Augsburg. In our opinion the divine illumination which he claimed to have received was simply the clear perception of such a consequence of his theory of faith—the doctrine of the *certainty of salvation*.

In his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, written in 1519, Luther formulates this essential principle of his theology as follows: ‘You must consider with firm confidence that Christ died for your own sins, that you are one of those for whom He was delivered. *There is the faith which justifies you.* It will make Christ to dwell and live and reign in you. It is the witness borne by the Spirit to our souls that we are the Sons of God.’¹

It was not in Luther’s character to keep to himself a doctrine which he found so comforting. He eagerly urged his pupils to embody it in theses defending the teaching he imparted to them. Luther encountered some opposition at first. He overcame it. Everybody about him professed ‘the utter impotence of man without grace’.

Luther nevertheless still persisted in believing himself a faithful son of the Church. ‘He was convinced that he was merely echoing, in a practical and beneficent doctrine, the great Christian mystics, notably St Bernard, Tauler, and Suso, and he himself published, first in 1516 and again in 1518, an anonymous mystical work entitled *German Theology* which he considered to be ‘as it were a summary of Tauler’s theology’.

Circumstances, however, were to set him in open and definite opposition to the Church. But nothing could shake the convictions of the man and he was to defy every form of authority brought against him.

¹ Weimar, II, p. 458

2 FROM THE INDULGENCE CONTROVERSY TO THE BREACH WITH ROME (1517-20)

It was the preaching of an Indulgence in south Germany in 1517 and the abuses connected with it which first brought him into conflict with the authority of Rome.

There is nothing easier than to justify the principle on which the granting of Indulgences in the Church is based. It rests on the doctrine that after the guilt of sin has been forgiven, there may yet be, and normally is, the need of reparation for this offence against the law of God. In the early Church an Indulgence was a release from the period of penance imposed on the individual repentant sinner. Later it was given a more general character and was proclaimed to be attached to special acts of piety, devotion, and charity, as a manifestation of the mercy of God through His Church. Every grant of Indulgences presupposes that the sinner has already repented and been reconciled by the Sacrament of Penance, one condition of such reconciliation being sorrow for past sin and a firm purpose not to sin again. It is therefore a fiction to represent an Indulgence as a forgiveness in advance and a licence to sin.

Indulgences were frequently granted for alms deeds, especially for alms given to hospitals and refuges for the poor.¹ They were also granted to those who gave funds for the building of churches and for the erection or rebuilding of many of the great cathedrals of the Middle Ages.

It is obvious that abuses might arise in the use of such grants to encourage charitable or religious generosity, even if such abuses went no further than a more earnest insistence on the payment of the money than on its sacred object and the spiritual conditions attached to it.

It is generally admitted that there were such abuses connected with the preaching in southern Germany of the Indulgences granted by Leo X for contributors to the funds that were to

¹ A German non-Catholic writer, Uhlhorn, in his *History of Christian Charitable Activities* (*Geschichte d. Christliche Liebesthatigkeit*, 1884, II 244), says of the medieval hospitals that 'one cannot go through the archives of any hospital without finding numerous grants of Indulgences'.

be collected to complete the building of the new Basilica of St. Peter's at Rome

But it is well to note that, both in the Papal grant and in the instructions to preachers who were to make the Indulgence known and receive the contributions of the people, it was clearly set forth that the vital condition was that all who desired to gain the Indulgence should make a true repentance and worthily approach the sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion, and that those who were too poor to bring any gift of money could equally with all others gain the Indulgence on fulfilling its spiritual conditions and praying for the Pope's intentions.

So far all was well, but when Germany was divided between three Commissioners appointed to give effect to the decree, the young prince archbishop of Mainz, Albert of Hohenzollern, one of the Electors of the Empire, was appointed Commissioner for the region that included Saxony and Brandenburg, and he made arrangements that at once opened the way to abuses, and provoked widespread discontent and hostile feeling.

He had already solicited from Rome and unfortunately had been granted one after another the archbishopric of Magdeburg, the title of Administrator of the Bishopric of Halberstadt, and, thirdly, the archbishopric of Mainz, one of the three ecclesiastical electorates in the Empire. Rome had stipulated, however, for a *commutation fee* of 10,000 ducats in return for such an unusual accumulation of benefices over and above the 14,000 ducats of *pallium dues* payable in respect of the archbishopric of Mainz.

To assist him in the payment of such an enormous sum—more than £10,000 of our money—the Roman Chancery suggested that, if he would at once pay the pallium dues, the proceeds of the preaching of the Indulgence in his district might be divided, one-half being allotted to the prince archbishop and the other half to the building fund of St. Peter's.

The archbishop paid the pallium dues with the help of an advance from the Fuggers, the leading bankers of the time, and it was arranged that their bank clerks should be present at the collection of money given for the building of St. Peter's in the

district assigned to the archbishop, keep the accounts, and direct all payments. It gave a very unpleasant business air to the whole proceedings, and all this added to the popular feeling against large sums of German money being levied for Rome.

The preaching of the Indulgences was entrusted by the archbishop to John Tetzel, a Dominican friar, a popular pulpit orator and a man of competent learning. One may grant that though his preaching as a whole was based on a sound conception of the Church's doctrine of Indulgences, in the rhetorical excitement of popular addresses he may have drifted into expressions that were not sufficiently guarded against misunderstanding. The most weighty complaint against him is that at times he gave it to be understood that the mere giving of the contributions to the alms chests might be effective as a suffrage that would at once deliver a soul from purgatory. In the statement of his teaching that he issued in reply to Luther's attack upon him he gives this a form that makes it innocuous enough if read in connexion with his clear declaration that the vital point for gaining any effect from the Indulgence must be sincere repentance—contrition and recourse to the Sacrament of Penance, with a firm purpose of amendment. But at the time the wildest charges were made against the Dominican preacher, who was represented by his enemies as a mere simoniacal dealer in Indulgences and even licences for future sin, in return for the payment of as much cash as he could wheedle ignorant audiences into handing over to Fugger's clerks. These attacks became a tradition of writers dealing with the Reformation from the non-Catholic standpoint. Here in England they have long been repeated in serious historical treatises, controversial pamphlets, and text-books for schools, without taking any account of Tetzel's own repudiation of the charges against him and the defence of his teaching by men of his time.¹

¹ The most complete and best documented study of Tetzel's career, and more particularly of his conduct and preaching in south Germany at this crisis, is to be found in the detailed work of Paulus, *Johann Tetzel der Ablassprediger* ('John Tetzel the Preacher of Indulgences'), Mainz, 1899. It is recognized by competent critics, both non-Catholic and Catholic, as dissipating the traditional misrepresentations of the preacher and his doctrine.

It is obvious that the transactions of the archbishop of Mainz with the bankers, and the presence of Fugger's representatives at the preachings might well excite opposition to Tetzel's mission, all the more because there had long been a growing feeling in Germany against the indirect taxation of the Roman Chancery, that made the time ripe for opposition to this new and general levy of money for Rome. Among the most orthodox Catholics there was widespread recognition of the danger involved in the connexion between a money-payment and a grant of an Indulgence. For instance, a man as far removed from heresy as Ximenes had forbidden all sales of Indulgences in his Spanish diocese. So now Catholic princes such as the Elector Frederick of Saxony and the dukes George of Saxony and William and Louis of Bavaria had tried to prevent any commissioners of the archbishop of Mainz from even entering their dominions to preach the Indulgence—possibly not without some feeling as to the elector archbishop of Mainz's personal interest in the proceedings. The situation was ripe for a serious rally of opposition among all classes in south Germany, if a leader could be found to voice the existing feeling. Luther's was the voice thus raised.

On the 31st October 1517 he nailed to the door of the Collegiate Church of Wittenberg ninety-five heads or propositions of argument in which he vehemently inveighed against the principle of Indulgences and the methods of the Roman tax-collectors.¹

The treasures of Indulgences [he declared] are now used as nets to ensnare the riches of men. If the Pope were aware of the extortions practised by the preachers of Indulgences, he would rather that the Basilica of St Peter's were reduced to ashes than that it should be built of the skin, the flesh and bones of his flock . . . Why does not

¹ It should be borne in mind that this was no gesture of histrionic defiance; it was an academic proceeding and as such had been the custom for hundreds of years. Theologians offered to maintain or dispute certain theses. They were in no way considered as committed to belief in the opinions which they advanced in the course of these disputations. Here was a doctor of theology to debate against all comers topics of common interest, but of a peculiar sort at a particular moment in a critical time. The powder was lying about in plenty. Luther supplied the spark.

the Pope, who is richer than the richest Croesus that ever lived, not raise his Basilica of St Peter with his own money rather than the contributions of so many poor among the faithful? [Theses Nos 66, 82, and 86]

The Papacy, in fact, although an international power, had never succeeded in making good its claim to impose an international system of taxation. National and racial jealousies continually peeped through the mantle of Catholic unity

Luther's action in the circumstances made an enormous impression. It must have exceeded his wildest expectations. In a night he had become the most famous man in Germany. The theses were acclaimed by an explosion of applause on the one hand and protestation on the other. The nation was divided into two camps.

The course of events thereafter was swift. Initial objections merely irritated Luther, who felt the forces of public opinion behind him. He charged head foremost first against the theologians, then he engaged the Papal Legate, Cardinal Cajetan, who in October 1518, summoned the rebel to appear before him at Augsburg and exhorted him in vain to retract his errors. He fled from Augsburg in the night of the 20th or 21st October, leaving to a notary the task of publishing an *Appeal from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope better-informed*. On the 28th November following, he appealed *from the Pope to a General Council*. The question of Indulgences was then relegated to the background. The curtain was torn aside. Luther emerged harnessed cap-à-pie in an armour which had been welded in solitary reflection in Wittenberg, tested in the fire of public disputation and popular preaching, and thenceforth inseparable from him. The fundamental antagonism between his doctrine and the doctrine of the Church made all hope of reconciliation impossible. It was soon to turn into open and insubordinate revolt. It was not the first time, to be sure, that the Church had been faced with such obstinate rebellion, but the absorbing question was whether the present heresy would develop into a widespread movement or remain an isolated individual case.

Many sympathizers had already given their adhesion to

Luther The university of Wittenberg was with him to a man, and Carlstadt, formerly a zealous Thomist, now showed himself a most ardent supporter of the ideas of his colleague. A young professor named Philip Melanchthon, a nephew of the celebrated John Reuchlin and an eminent Hellenist, had arrived at Wittenberg on the 25th August and at once stood forth as a faithful disciple of the Augustinian monk. The incidents of the drama which had begun were followed with passionate interest in every presbytery and monastery in Germany. A Swiss student, John Kessler, was shortly to note in his chronicle entitled *Sabbata* the wonder felt by all the youth at living in such an extraordinary time when more marvellous things were to be seen 'than in the three preceding centuries'

A number of champions had, however, arisen to defend the dogmas of Catholicism against the attacks of Luther and his friends. The most distinguished of them was John Eck, professor in the university of Ingolstadt. He challenged Carlstadt and Luther to a great public tourney of debate, in Leipzig. The disputation took place with a great parade of ceremony in a crowded hall in Duke George's palace before an immense throng of spectators between the 27th June and the 16th July 1519. John Eck led the discussion on the essential point the authority of the Pope, the successor of St. Peter, appointed to maintain the necessary unity of the Church of Christ. He drove Luther hard against several conciliar definitions, notably the decrees of the Council of Constance, against John Hus. Luther rejected, not without hesitation, the authority even of a General Council. All he was left with was the Bible. He abandoned one position after another until in the end he found himself in open conflict with the very authorities which until then he had considered sovereign. Rarely has the leader of a movement been less aware of the direction in which he was moving.

The Leipzig disputation marked a turning-point in Luther's development. Thereafter he was determined to break with Rome, but he waited for a favourable opportunity. The Catholics, on the other hand, had plucked up courage. The

universities were on the point of declaring against the heresy. Luther's case in Rome—it had begun shortly after the Indulgence Controversy but had been interrupted by attempts at reconciliation and then by political events, the death in January 1519 of the Emperor Maximilian and the furious competition between Francis I and Charles of Austria to secure the imperial crown—was resumed at the instigation of John Eck, the victor in the Leipzig debate. At this critical moment Luther received the interested support of the knights¹ and the young revolutionary humanists, both represented in the person of Ulrich von Hutten, a redoubtable agitator and virulent pamphleteer. They were strange allies for one who posed as a reformer. He accepted their help, nevertheless, at any rate passively, and with their assistance took the perilous step from secret and personal revolt to open rebellion against Rome.

On the 10th July 1520 he wrote 'The die is cast! I despise the fury and the favour of Rome. I will have no reconciliation or communion with them for all eternity'². A week later he explained the reason for this decision by declaring 'Silvester von Schaumberg and Franz von Sickingen (two German knights of whom the latter, posing as the champion of the poor and a Gospel pioneer, became the notorious leader of the Ritterschaft) have henceforth set me free from all human fear.'³ On the 1st August he published his famous proclamation, the *Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation concerning the reformation of the Christian Commonwealth*, which made an impression throughout the country comparable only to the sensation

¹ The English word 'knights' poorly renders the significance of the German *Ritterschaft*. They indulged in incessant private war and they therefore resisted any attempt to establish orderly government. They earned their livelihood in wholesale brigandage and but for the restraining force of the territorial princes would probably have succeeded in reducing all Germany to anarchy.

² Enders, II 432

³ Enders, letter of the 17th July 1520, II 443. Both these knights had offered him a refuge from Rome in their castles. The author's belief is that it is a necessary inference from this circumstance that the elector of Saxony was not yet the open and avowed patron of Luther. Kalkhoff and Anni Koch maintain the contrary view cf. *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xxiii (1926), pp. 213 et seq.

caused by the theses on Indulgences, three years earlier. In October he continued his revolutionary work by publishing his *Prelude to the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*, followed in November by a pamphlet, *The Liberty of a Christian Man*. The revolutionary spirit animating these three works may be summed up in a few words. Their object was to discredit the claim of the clergy to be a special and essential order in Christian society set apart from the laity by virtue of their vocation.

The truth is that no class nor caste can retain its social privileges once its social utility has disappeared. The feudal caste, for example, which had maintained order and security more or less effectively throughout the Middle Ages, was bound to lose its importance once absolute monarchies supported by standing armies and a regular system of finance were able to reassume the role of public protection. So the clergy, which had formerly embodied all the aspirations of society towards learning, knowledge, and art, could not hope to continue to exercise the same kind of influence once learning had become through faculties of arts, law, and medicine, and by the marvellously prolific invention of printing, a possession commonly held by many lay-folk. The clergy, however, still retained one essential and indefeasible quality: they remained by definition charged with the exalted task of assisting men to secure *eternal salvation*, that 'one indispensable necessity' of Christian souls.

Unfortunately, for three centuries past, and more especially since the Great Schism, many of the clergy had come to discharge this sacred mission more and more perfunctorily. Pope and bishop, priest and monk, large numbers in every rank of the clergy seemed to be more engrossed with terrestrial interests than with the administration of the Sacraments. A reform of the clergy 'in its head and members', the persistent cry throughout the past three centuries, was universally admitted to brook no delay. Luther instead of introducing a reform proceeded to a radical amputation.

The doctrine he had conceived some years before his revolt against the Church was admirably fitted to such an end. If we

are saved by faith alone without good works, what need is there of priests to minister to us salvation? The clergy might conceivably retain the function of instruction in religious doctrine, without which the faith which justifies could not even come into being. But Luther had come to assert that the sole source of infallible religious instruction was the Bible. Henceforth it would be sufficient to put the Bible in the hands of everybody, and salvation would be assured. The Bible would take the place once held by the clergy. All that was necessary was to take the Bible out of the hands of the clergy and put it into the hands of the laity, proclaiming the ‘universal priesthood’. This was the intention of the *Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*. Next the part played by the minister-priest in the dispensation of the Sacraments had to be reduced to a minimum. *The Prelude to the Babylonish Captivity of the Church* provided for that by reducing the number of the Sacraments to two, and above all by depriving the Mass of its *sacrificial* character. Further, what remained of the Sacraments was important and efficacious only through faith which alone justified. While Luther was busily engaged in his work of destruction, the Church declared against him. The Bull *Exsurge Domine* of the 15th June 1520 condemned forty-one of his theses and called upon him to retract under penalty of excommunication. It had been drawn up by Cajetan, Prierias, and John Eck. Luther’s sole answer was to burn the Bull publicly at Wittenberg on the 10th December. On the 3rd January 1521 he was formally excommunicated. It was now the turn of the Emperor to speak. The Church invited him to enforce her judgement against an admitted and contumacious heresiarch.

3. THE IMPOTENCE OF THE EMPEROR: BIRTH OF A PROTESTANT CHURCH

Maximilian had died suddenly on the 12th January 1519, and the Emperor, since the 28th June 1520, had been the young and self-willed Charles V. Girolamo Aleander, the Papal legate, received from him the most encouraging welcome. The Emperor was only too anxious to enforce the condemnations

of the Church against Luther. But he did not think it possible to condemn the reformer without first hearing what he had to say for himself. He therefore decided to send him a safe-conduct with the summons to attend before the Diet assembled at Worms in April 1521. The legate himself observed the violence of anti-Roman feeling in Germany and the immense popularity of Luther. 'All Germany', he wrote on the 8th February with a touch of rhetorical exaggeration, 'is in an upheaval. Nine out of every ten people shout "Luther!"', and the tenth, if indifferent to what Luther says, at any rate shouts "Death to the Court of Rome!" They are all clamouring for "A Council! A Council!", and they insist upon having it in Germany.'¹

Luther therefore felt himself more than ever encouraged and supported by his own people. He had become the national hero. He appeared before the Diet of Worms on the 17th and 18th April. On the second day, in answer to the invitation addressed to him to retract his errors, he made the famous declaration.

Unless I be convinced by proof from Holy Scripture and plain reason—for I do not believe in the Pope or Councils which certainly have often erred and contradicted themselves—I am bound by the texts which I have adduced. I neither can nor dare retract anything, for my conscience is a captive to God's word, and it is neither safe nor right to go against conscience. There I take my stand. I can do no otherwise. So help me God! Amen.

The dispatches of the Venetian ambassador, Gasparo Contarini, dated respectively the 25th and the 26th April, testify to the deep impression which Luther's bold and uncompromising attitude had made on the German princes. The archbishop Albrecht of Mainz himself declared in a letter to Pope Leo X that 'Luther's adherents' increased and multiplied daily, and that 'few indeed were the laity who were well-disposed to the clergy', that many ecclesiastics even were passing over to the camp of Luther and declaring themselves against Rome.²

¹ Brieger, *Aleander und Luther*, 1521, part 1 (Gotha 1894), at p. 48.

² Balan, *Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae, ex tabulis S. Sedis secretis, 1521–5*, Ratisbon, 1883–4, at p. 268.

Such being the state of affairs, the whole of Germany was prevented from slipping into *schism* probably only by the resolute determination which the Emperor proclaimed in a speech in the Diet on the 19th April, that he would not tolerate 'a mere monk, relying simply on his private judgement, setting himself up against the faith professed by all Christians for more than a thousand years and impudently concluding that all Christian people before him had been deceived'. He spoke with extreme vigour. 'I am resolved', he declared, 'to engage in this matter all my territories, my friends, my body, my blood, my life and my soul'

But the power of the Emperor was not so extensive as to cause the decisions of the Diet and his own orders to be carried out. If Luther came into collision with the political power of the Emperor allied to the Pope, he was to be saved and his doctrine along with him by political influences, which, mysterious in the beginning and operating in secret, rapidly emerged into the open and became exposed to the light of day.

The Edict of Worms had pronounced the Ban of the Empire against Luther, signed on the 26th May 1521, it was antedated as from 8th May.¹ Ever since the evening of the 4th May he had quietly concealed himself in the Castle of the Wartburg. His immediate sovereign, the elector Frederick of Saxony, considered the condemnation of the most distinguished professor of his university merely as a blow directed against his interests and his territorial independence and determined to defy the imperial decree in his own way. He had been dubbed 'the Saxon fox', and on this occasion justified the appellation. He gave orders for Luther to be captured by a band of soldiers on his journey homewards and taken in disguise to a lonely fortress. There the Reformer remained for ten months in torment of soul and body, but firmly resolved to continue to resist the Supreme Pontiff, whom he now described as Anti-Christ.

There still remained one difficult step for him to take. If he remained in hiding in the Wartburg, he was abandoning his

¹ That is to say he was outlawed and in theory might be killed with impunity

doctrine and his party to chance. There was none but himself capable of guiding the adolescent, still unformed Church which owed its existence to his name and his authority. True he had given his partisans for a watchword the Bible and the Bible only. But no society can exist without a constitution and an organized leadership. Luther had destroyed the authority of the Pope willy-nilly, he became the Pope of a counter-church. In his absence neither Melanchthon, who was young and timid, nor Carlstadt, who lacked judgement and prudence, could control the movement. It was precisely the tactlessness and temerity of his followers which gave him the opportunity of reappearing on the stage from which he had been momentarily excluded by a lingering fear of the imperial decrees.

The impetuous and unstable Carlstadt and Gabriel Zwilling, another Augustinian monk, had taken an initiative with, they believed, the approval of Luther, but it was apt to irritate the elector, who was anxious, in spite of everything, to avoid any too outrageous scandal. They denounced clerical celibacy, and demanded that marriage should be made compulsory for secular priests and optional for regulars. They denounced the whole institution of monasticism and demanded that monastic vows should be abolished. They denounced the adoration of the Eucharist as sinful and demanded that the Mass should be suppressed. Luther at first approved with an appearance of willingness. At the same time he certainly felt a lively irritation at seeing his party in other hands than his own and a well-founded fear of wearying the elector's patience and so losing the benefit of his very necessary protection.

Wittenberg was in an upheaval. Monks were leaving their convents, priests were taking wives, the ceremonies of the Mass were being radically altered. A *German Mass* was celebrated on Christmas eve by Carlstadt in person and the Sacrament administered in both kinds. The preparatory confession, the elevation of the Host, and the Canon implying the sacrificial nature of the celebration, were omitted. There was an influx of *Prophets* from Zwickau who went to further extravagances. They declared that their inspiration was derived from the Holy

Ghost, and repudiating infant baptism, insisted that adults should be rebaptized¹

Anarchy threatened to dissolve the party founded by Luther. The elector was inundated with protests. The Council of the Empire was about to intervene. Was there life in the Lutheran movement or not? In other words, was it capable of organizing itself and taking its place in the structure of existing institutions? The question was one of life and death and Luther realized it. He had the skill to understand what was in the mind of his immediate sovereign, to guess what his intentions were, and, without saying so openly, to adapt himself accordingly. Braving the ban of the Empire, he left the Wartburg and reappeared at Wittenberg on the 6th March 1522. He was welcomed as a Confessor of the Faith who had escaped martyrdom, and in a course of eight sermons extending over a week, rallied his followers, re-established order, and quelled the agitation.

This marked the term of Luther's evolution. He had the sense of order and unity, but he had no talent for administration and co-ordination. He created nothing new. Anxious to restore ecclesiastical discipline, but incapable of returning to the Pope and admitting his error, he saw that one course only was open to him, to entrust the control of his Church to the princes. He had begun with a dream of liberty and equality among all Christians, subject only to the authority of the Word of God. he was to end with a *State Church*. The dictum of the Protestant historian Harnack is, therefore, well founded. 'The Reformation ends in a contradiction.'²

During the lifetime of the elector, Frederick the Wise, there was no question of any official intervention by the State in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, except to expel from the country at Luther's request dissentients such as Carlstadt, Munzer, and Stubner. They departed to labour in other fields.

¹ These enthusiasts were afterwards known as Anabaptists. They also held the tenets of the later Fifth Monarchy men in England. They prophesied an imminent bloody purification of the Church and attempted to verify their prophecy after the fashion of their kind by beginning with the slaughter of their opponents at Zwickau. The plot was discovered, however, and their leaders *more suo* fled to Wittenberg.

² *Dogmengeschichte*, III. 788

But on the accession of John of Saxony in May 1525, the idea of giving the civil power authority over the new Church took shape and issued, in 1528, in the *Instructions concerning the Visitation of Churches*, which may be regarded as the charter of the *State religion*.

Luther's disillusion found expression in the sorrowful lines he penned on the 7th January 1527 to his faithful friend George Burkhardt of Spelt (Spalatin) 'Hitherto I have foolishly hoped for something superhuman from men, that they might be led by the Gospel. But experience has taught me that, in contempt of the Gospel, they need to be constrained by laws and the sword.'¹

How this State organization of the Lutheran churches was realized will be shown when we come to describe in greater detail the political advent of Lutheranism. Luther thought he discerned in the princely patronage accorded to him a mark of divine favour towards his doctrine. The truth was he had been defeated. He had dreamed of a renovation of the whole Church. All he achieved was the establishment of local sects, while the great Church in the interval continued her career and soon effected her own Reform by herself—without Luther and against him.

4 HULDREICH ZWINGLI

The development of the Swiss reformer, Huldreich (or Ulrich) Zwingli, is very different from that of Luther. Luther, of his own confession, had remained 'a peasant, a rough Saxon boor'; Zwingli had acquired some refinement in contact with the Humanists and yet retained the primitive vigour and boldness of character he had inherited from his mountain ancestry. Luther had led a tormented, agitated life in his monastery. His theology was born of his personal temperament and morality. He had long been a heretic without knowing it. Even after the Indulgence Controversy he clung, so to speak, to some vague desire for Catholic unity, and he could write, for instance, on the 21st August 1518. 'I shall never be a heretic.'

¹ Enders, vi 6

I may err in discussion, but I will assert nothing out of obstinacy¹ He had been driven by degrees out of the Church both by the impulse of an over-sensitive and too-irritable temperament, incapable of controlling itself or of pausing to consider the subtle gradations which distinguish truth from error, and by encouragements from all sides which finally carried him off his feet. Zwingli, on the other hand, seems to have waited for the opportunity to create a rupture which had long matured in his mind before breaking out in public. They were utterly unlike in character and their hatred was mutual almost as soon as they met²

Huldreich Zwingli was born on New Year's Day, 1484, at Wildhaus, an Alpine hamlet in the valley of Toggenburg at the foot of the Santis heights. His parents, whose old farmstead still exists, were people of consequence in their district. His father was the village bailiff, the *amman* (the inhabitants had gained the right of electing their own bailiff), while his uncle Bartholomew was the parish priest. He was one of ten children, eight sons and two daughters. Huldreich's paternal uncle, becoming rural dean and rector of Wesen, on the lake of Wallenstadt, in 1487, took his nephew with him to begin his education and afterwards sent him first to Basel (1494-8) and then to Berne (1498-1500), where his teacher was the learned Heinrich Wolflin (Lupulus), a poet and Latinist of distinction and the future reformer of Berne, who inspired him with a feeling for the classics of pagan antiquity. Huldreich evinced a marked disposition for study and a considerable aptitude for music and singing. The Dominicans in Berne would have welcomed him gladly in their noviciate, but his uncle sent him to the university of Vienna instead, where he remained for two years, returning to matriculate in Basel (1502). He had found employ-

¹ Enders, 1 219

² The works of Zwingli are published in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, next after those of Calvin, beginning with vol. lxxxviii in course of publication. The best of the earlier editions is that edited by Schuler and Schulthess, *Huldreich Zwingli Opera*, 8 vols., Zurich, 1828-42, with a Supplement edited by Schulthess and Marthaler, Zurich, 1861. The best scientific biography is R. Stahelin's *Huldreich Zwingli, sein Leben und Werken nach den Quellen dargestellt*, in two vols., Bâle, 1895-7.

ment in the town as usher in the parish school of St Martin and could thereby the more easily defray the expenses of his own university studies. He was fond of relating afterwards that one of his teachers in Basel, whom he describes as 'the most devout and very learned Thomas Wytttenbach' of Bienne, had taught him as early as 1505-6, that is to say long before the Lutheran Revolution, that 'the traffic in Indulgences was mere charlatanry and lying' and that 'the death of Christ alone was the price paid for the remission of sins'. On the latter point, at all events, Wytttenbach had taught him nothing but what would have received the warmest approval of the purest Catholic theology. In fact, however, Wytttenbach's school seems to have been a seminary of future reformers Wolfgang Kopfli (Capito), Conrad Kurschner (Pellican), and Leo Jud had also been his pupils.

Through his uncle's influence, Huldreich in 1506 was given the cure of souls at Glarus, an important town with three out-lying hamlets in the deanery of Wesen. He had himself ordained priest in Constance and proceeded to his parish. His life thence-forward was the life of most parish priests of his time with the exception that he was an ardent Humanist and read with enthusiasm his beloved classical authors, both Greek and Latin. Moreover, he took a lively interest in the life of his fellow citizens and an active part in their political discussions. He was strongly opposed to the party which favoured the French. He dissuaded his parishioners from enlisting in the service of any prince other than the Pope. Ever since the defeat of Charles the Bold, the Swiss were accounted the best soldiers in Europe. They willingly hired their courage and warlike skill to the highest bidder. When they set out on distant profitable campaigns they were as a rule accompanied by their parish priests, and so Zwingli attended his flock, as chaplain, on three occasions, in 1512, 1513, and 1515, in the service of the Pope in Italy.¹ He even received a pension from the Pope as a reward for his zeal, but when the French party, after Marignano, gained the upper hand at Glarus, he was forced to leave his parish in charge of

¹ He may have been present at Navara on the 6th June 1513, and at Marignano on the 13th-14th September 1515

a curate and became people's priest or vicar of the parish at Einsiedeln (14th April 1516), already then as now the centre of a famous pilgrimage

There is clearly no point of resemblance between such a life and that of Luther no torturing scruple, no heart-searching problem, no spiritual anguish, no mysticism. Zwingli was naturally robust and cheerful. He read Cicero and Lucian, Plutarch and Livy, with the same ardour and the same devotion with which he read Holy Scripture Erasmus was his especial predilection. In other respects he enjoyed the pleasures of life: he did not pride himself on being a pattern of morals. When he was transferred in 1518 at the instance of his friend the Humanist Myconius (Oswald Geisshessler), schoolmaster at the Minster school, to the post of people's priest at the Great Minster of Zurich, the Chapter which elected him (11th December 1518), by a majority of seven in twenty-four votes, and fully realized his value as a writer and popular preacher no less than as a fervent patriot, asked him for an explanation of certain errors of conduct in violation of clerical celibacy. He wrote on the 5th December to Canon Uttinger and very candidly confessed his frailties. The truth was he had struggled hard, and three years before had taken a vow, in accordance with the precepts of St. Paul, never again to have guilty relations with any woman. A year and six months later he had had another lapse 'God knows', he declared, 'I make this confession to my great shame and from the bottom of my heart' but he believed that he could justify himself, at least partially, by protesting that he had never consorted with a married woman, an innocent maid, or a nun. The wench with whom he did not deny having had relations had long had a record of conduct that left much to desire.

Such an avowal throws a lurid light on the morals of many unfortunate priests of the time and explains the innumerable apostasies from the ranks of the clergy.

This moral weakness, no doubt, contains the explanation of the vital importance such men attached to the dogma of justification by faith alone. In the case of Luther frequent

temptations, as has been seen, brought their attendant train of violent scruples for Zwingli the problem was not beset with so many difficulties. But as he still retained some faith and was ever haunted by the thought of salvation, he did not resign himself, like many pagan Humanists of his time, to abandoning all idea of eternal happiness. He clung to a trust in the infinite mercy of the Saviour. He led a double life of sin on the one hand and prayer and confidence in Christ on the other. To him still more than to Luther Wundt's remark applies, that the Reformation introduced a new moral code into the world which was 'merely the reflection of the profound significance of life which is characteristic of the Renaissance'.

There was, indeed, at the time, as it were, a frenzy of sensual enjoyment. But the Christian faith was ever there, with its prescriptions and prohibitions, holding the formidable image of eternal sanctions erect above the temptations of the flesh. A current issuing from Humanism tended to obscure the menacing prospect of the hereafter from the human horizon and to reassure all who were intoxicated by life in this world. Art, literature, and learning might, if put to it, provide mundane existence with that idealized atmosphere with which the man who is not utterly the slave of the senses cannot dispense. But such a current, although it flowed strongly in Italy, was scarcely felt in Germany, France, and other Christian countries. Religion, they imagined, could be saved from the horns of the dilemma between a moral law impossible of fulfilment and the imperious instincts of nature in a century exuberant with life and youth.

Luther had made the attempt in hurling from the Wartburg, where all the temptations of the world had apparently combined to assault him, the famous formula which is the summary of his faith. *Pecca fortiter, sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo!* 'Be a sinner and sin boldly, but believe and rejoice still more lustily in Christ. . . . Sin will not separate us from that Divine Lamb, even though we commit the sin of the flesh and murder a million times a day.'¹

Zwingli had reached an absolutely identical conclusion inde-

¹ Letter to Melanchthon of the 1st August 1521 Enders, III 207.

pendedently: he maintained, as we have seen, that he had received it from Wyttenbach

There is nothing, therefore, to be surprised at in his ardour to preach the Gospel, as interpreted in the light of this new doctrine that the Commandments are not intended to be literally fulfilled, but to make us guilty, to constitute us candidates for the free pardon of the divine Redeemer.

Zwingli came to Zurich on the 27th December 1518. Four days later he appeared before the Chapter and announced his intention of preaching no longer on the selected passages read at Sunday Mass but on the Gospel, consecutively, page by page. Nothing in itself could be less objectionable. Such had been the consistent practice of the Fathers of the Church, and many contemporary Catholic preachers continue to follow their example. But the Church at the time had the best of reasons for distrusting the manner in which preachers such as Zwingli proposed to comment upon the sacred text. Zwingli, nevertheless, carried out his scheme. He followed the lines he had laid down for himself and expounded in his own way the Gospel of St Matthew, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles to Timothy and the Galatians, and the two Epistles of St. Peter without the slightest reference to any patristic interpretation. At the same time (February 1519) he made a vigorous protest against a Franciscan, a certain Bernardin Sanson, who had come to Zurich to picach an Indulgence, but more fortunate than Luther he did not attract the censures of the Holy See.¹ Sanson, on the other hand, was ordered by the Pope himself not to vex the authorities of Zurich and to leave Switzerland—a proof that abuses could be and were sometimes checked when brought to the knowledge of the proper authorities.

The year 1519 was distinguished at Zurich by a fearful calamity. Plague broke out in the city on the 10th August. Zwingli was taking the waters. He returned at once, sell a

¹ It should be observed that Zwingli in this matter had the full support of the bishop of Constance, who forbade the clergy of his diocese to admit Sanson into their churches. So the Franciscan cardinal, Fray Ximencz de Cisneros, archbishop of Toledo, six years earlier, had forbidden the preaching of the Indulgence in his diocese.

victim to the disease, and lay ill and in danger of death from September 1519 to the following March, with subsequent alternating bouts of comparative health. He had no sooner recovered than he continued his campaign of preaching, and his sermons attracted the populace. He had won a vast audience 'more than 2,000 followers', he tells us. There was some show of opposition from the Chapter on the one hand and from the three religious houses in the town on the other. But public opinion was for him. In 1520 he officially renounced the pension he had been receiving from the Pope as ex-military chaplain and began to exert great public influence. There was no prince in Zurich to inhibit him, no such opposition to fear as Luther encountered at Wittenberg. Zurich was one of the thirteen cantons in the Swiss confederation and administered by a town council. The members of the council had not been behindhand in taking an interest in such novelties as the sermons and doctrine preached by Zwingli. They showed that they had taken his instruction to heart by decreeing in December 1520 that every preacher in the canton was to preach 'the Holy Gospels and the Epistles of the Apostles in accordance with the Word of God and the true divine scriptures of the Old and New Testament'.

Zwingli, however, did not confine himself to purely religious sermons. He made frequent excursions into politics. He inveighed against the abuse of recruiting contracts for mercenary service with foreign princes and especially France. When he became a canon in the Minster on the 29th April 1521 with a prebend of seventy gulden, a benefice which gave him the citizenship of Zurich, his political importance increased and his advice was still more taken into account and appreciated. In the course of the month of May, the town formally forbade mercenary service throughout the canton under pain of death. Zurich thereby found itself completely isolated from the other cantons both politically and religiously.

Zwingli had gone to work with consummate skill. In this respect also he differed essentially from Luther. He advanced like a general in command of an army, making certain of his

line of retreat and preparing a strongly fortified position in the event of his being attacked Rome had justified his protest against the traffic in Indulgences It has been alleged that the Curia attached more importance to the useful services he might render as an eventual recruiting agent than to any havoc he might work in religious matters. The conjecture is quite baseless The truth is that hitherto he had denounced only abuses and always covered himself with the authority of Holy Scripture. He had now the support of the great council of the city, the Two Hundred, for his views: it met for special purposes and numbered more precisely 212. He was now standing on consolidated ground and risked a further advance. The town suffered with impatience the yoke of the bishop of Constance, a city which did not even form part of the confederation. Nothing was easier than to set the power of the Two Hundred against the bishop This Zwingli determined to do, but in his own way, at once bold and cautious, cunning to await his opportunity, to attempt only what was practicable and serviceable. It was a favourite maxim of his that wild beasts were only to be delicately stroked, their attacks to be yielded to a little 'until, reduced to subjection by our patience and the fearless fortitude of our hearts, they become completely tamed'.¹

Early in 1522 he felt strong enough to risk the venture. The principle upon which he established what he described as his reformation was the following *The Bible shall be the rule of doctrine and religious worship.* The authority of the bishop was consequently to be excluded and the town council alone was to be called upon to give the commands of the Bible the force of law.

The conflict first broke out with reference to the Lenten fast. On Ash Wednesday, the 5th March 1522, a number of citizens, emboldened by his preaching, publicly broke the precept of fasting and abstinence by deliberately eating meat. Leo Jud, a friend of Zwingli and his successor as parish priest of

¹ *Huldreich Zwingli Opera* Schuler and Schultess, vol. vii, p. 187, Zwingli's letter to his friend Berthold Haller, the Berne reformer, under date 29th December 1521. It should be observed that the principle of recourse to *the Bible alone* is just as Erasmian as it is Lutheran.

Einsiedeln, was of their number. Zwingli himself was present. This proceeding provoked a scandal and riots broke out in the streets. The printer, Christopher Froschauer, in whose house the Lenten abstinence had been broken, pleaded guilty, but attempted to justify himself by a reference to the teaching of Zwingli, 'a preacher second to none in all Germany and a glory to the city'.

On the 23rd March Zwingli publicly undertook to defend his friends from the pulpit. He maintained that the choice of food was free and that any one seeking to impose abstinence under pain of grave sin was himself committing a mortal sin.

The bishop of Constance, however, became alarmed. He sent his coadjutor (Melchior Watth) to Zurich. The suffragan opened an inquiry and laid before the council a formal complaint against the offenders. The council decided in his favour, and on the 9th April 1522, prohibited the eating of meat during Lent and punished the guilty parties. This was a defeat for Zwingli, but he was unmoved. His position was still very strong. He had the populace behind him and he knew that elected councils are obliged to take account of public opinion, and, besides, do not last for ever. He therefore publicly maintained his thesis in defiance of the bishop by publishing on the 16th April the conclusions of his sermon of the 23rd March *On the Choice or Freedom of Food*.

The issue was joined. The adversaries retaliated, blow for blow. The bishop, Hugo von Landenberg, was encouraged and advised by his vicar-general, an energetic man and the determined opponent of the ill-considered innovations of the Reformers. His name was John Heierlin, latinized by the custom of the time as *Faber*. The Federal Council also came into the line to defend the Catholic tradition.

Zwingli felt the need of enrolling recruits to his banner. Ten priests of his following, including Leo Jud, who had just been appointed to Zurich, gave him their adhesion. He drafted, and they all signed, a petition to the bishop and the Federal Council, 2nd and 13th July, claiming liberty to preach the Gospel and liberty for priests to marry. What he did not

disclose was that after having avoided—at any rate as far as our sources enable us to form an opinion—giving cause for scandal by his conduct, which, as has been seen, had not always been above reproach in his youth, but had since become blameless, he had since his arrival in Zurich secretly married, early in 1522, a widow of the name of Anne Reinhart, who had been the wife of Hans Meyer of Knonau, son of a distinguished family

Zwingli practised political prudence to such a degree that he did not dare admit his marriage or publicly celebrate it until two years after the event, whereas priests at his instigation had already taken such a step in April 1523. The least to be said on such a subject is that Zwingli's morals did not specially qualify him to pose as a Reformer in the bosom of the Church of Jesus Christ.

He was now making giant strides towards a definitive breach with the old order of things. He began preaching against the monastic life, against the practice of confession, against feast days not mentioned in the Bible. On the 22nd August 1522 he published a full statement of his position and a refutation of the bishop's pronouncements under the title of *Archeteles*—the beginning and end of the matter. Despite the prohibitions of the council, debates between Catholics and Zwinglians continued from pulpit to pulpit. Leo Jud proved himself one of the most ardent assistants of the bold innovator. Zwingli delivered a master-stroke by inviting the council to take the initiative in calling all priests together for a Public Disputation in solemn form which was appointed to be held in Zurich on the 29th January 1523. The minds of men had been won over to the seductive principle of *Biblicism*. They failed to see that such a principle carries its own refutation. For the Gospel does not relate that our Lord ever wrote anything or ordered any record to be made. It relates on the contrary that He founded a visible Church with a hierarchy, with which the Christian Faith was to be deposited and who with His assistance was to preserve it free from error at all times even to the consummation of the world. In other words Biblicism is not to be found in the Bible. The Bible nowhere states that it is the sole canon of

revealed truth. Besides, we should know nothing of the canonical scriptures if they had not been guaranteed to us by the infallibility of the Church. In this sense St Augustine has said 'I would not believe in the Gospel, if I were not moved thereto by the authority of the Catholic Church '¹

In striking contrast to these words of that great Doctor Zwingli had published on the 19th January, with a view to the impending disputation, a statement of his own doctrine in sixty-seven theses, the first of which was framed as follows 'Whosoever declares that the Gospel is nothing without the assent and approval of the Church deceives himself and blasphemes God.'

The council of Zurich does not seem to have perceived any more clearly than the Reformer the contradiction latent in the statement that the Bible is the sole source of religious truth and the proposal to have the debate presided over by a political assembly. The city magistrates were therefore given the last word in the matter.

The disputation took place on the appointed day before an audience of 600. Faber defended Catholicism. Zwingli's sixty-seven theses provided a basis of discussion. The battle was hotly contested with especial reference to the eighteenth thesis, against the sacrifice of the Mass. The burgomaster Roust put an end to the disputation by declaring in the name of the council that none had been able to convict Zwingli's evangelical teaching of heresy. The Reformer immediately followed up his victory by publishing on the 14th July 1523 his *Auslegung und Begründung der Schlussreden*, or Exposition and Proof of his Articles, his most important work in German.

The marriage of priests had begun on the 28th April. Nuns were now given permission to leave their convents and marry. A protest by the bishop, dated the 10th July, was ineffectual. Zwingli had his hands full in restraining the ardour of his friends and keeping public order. Like Luther he had no hesitation in putting down extremists. He condemned images and pictures, but he would have had them destroyed by official decree and

¹ *Contra Epistolam quam dicunt Fundamenti*, 5

not by rioting A second disputation took place from the 26th to the 28th October on the subject of images and pictures and once again on the Mass. Zwingli's party naturally gained another victory The judges had been won to his cause before a word had been spoken The council, however, took a decisive step in deciding on the 27th October 1523, without waiting for the conclusion of the debate or consulting the bishop, that Mass should be abolished and images and pictures removed. The following year, the adherents of the 'old religion' were invited to submit or to leave the country. Mass ceased to be said in Zurich on the Wednesday in Holy Week, the 12th April 1524

Zwingli had achieved a result very similar to Luther's. a Biblicalism controlled and guaranteed by the State police One had constructed a form of religion suited to an autocratic principality, the other had striven to establish his Church and his doctrine in an autocratic republic. Neither admitted toleration for dissenters Neither was prepared to suffer the existence of Catholicism in the State in which he was all powerful Both were to oppose with equal severity the attempts at social revolution inspired by their teaching in the populace.

Zwingli, moreover, would seem to have modelled his doctrine on Luther's as far as the fundamental and utterly unbiblical dogma of 'predestination' was concerned but he was radically divided from him on the subject of the 'Real Presence'

5. ZWINGLIANISM

Zwingli's principal German work was, as has been said, the *Auslegung und Begründung der Schlussreden*, 'a farrago of all the opinions controverted to-day', which made its appearance on the 14th July 1523. But the Reformer's essential work, the book in which his theological ideas with the exception of predestination, which in his scheme is merely accidental, are most clearly set forth, is a Latin work entitled *De Vera et Falsa Religione* (March 1525) Luther had started off from a subjective principle justification by faith alone, which responded to a very personal spiritual need at the same time as it expressed the inarticulate aspirations of the time The appeal to the Bible

as the sole guide had been merely a means of escaping all control and authority on this essential point

Zwingli, on the other hand, made Biblicalism his starting-point. His doctrine was more formalist than subjectivist. His recourse to the Bible was inspired both by his Humanist education and his own peculiar spirit of independence. Erasmus never ceased to repeat that 'Christ pure and simple must be derived . . . from the sources themselves',¹ with the assistance of the knowledge of ancient languages. But the object of such a principle in the case alike of Erasmus and of Jacques Lefevre of Étaples was to renew theology, in Erasmus' phrase to 'warm it up again'. In the hands of men like Luther and Zwingli, it turned into a weapon against the Church. Zwingli made use of the Biblical principle to get rid of every obligation he found irksome in the discipline of Catholicism.

Like Luther, he was constantly speaking in eloquent and affecting words of God and the Redemption wrought by Jesus. If he did not lay as much stress as Luther on the contrast between the fall of man through original sin and the infinite purity of God and His Divine Son, he nevertheless held with Luther that by the fault of Adam we are utterly corrupt, incapable of the least good and so destined to damnation, unless we are saved by the faith which throws us into the compassionate arms of the Saviour.

Zwingli saw no more clearly than Luther the manifest contradiction in the statement of the infinite goodness of God, His boundless mercy and perfect justice, and the barbarous theory of an absolute predestination whereby God condemns to Hell creatures issued from His hands and deprived of every means to salvation and at the same time grants to others who have done nothing to deserve it the gratuitous blessing of the faith which justifies and saves.

Such a contradiction is more revolting in the case of Zwingli than in the case of Luther, because Zwingli, like a good

¹ Herminjard, *Correspondence of the Reformers in French-speaking Countries*, 1 30 (letter to Wolfgang Capito of the 26th February 1517), 1 55 (letter to Beroaldus of the 9th August 1519), 1 56 (letter to Pope Leo X himself of the 13th August 1519).

Humanist, laid special stress on the attributes of goodness, wisdom, absolute truth, and sovereign providence possessed by the Divinity, so that it becomes utterly incomprehensible that such a God could have brought impotent creatures into existence, simply in order to damn them for ever and ever.

Zwingli, moreover, was more logical than Luther in reducing the Sacraments to the condition of being merely exterior *symbols* of Christian brotherhood. If we are saved by faith alone, the Sacraments as channels of grace would seem to be useless. Zwingli, however, did not dare to push to extremes his principle of admitting nothing into religious worship but elements to be found in the Bible. He was told by extremists: 'The only prayer we admit is the Lord's Prayer. That is the only prayer mentioned in the Bible.' But despite his strong desire to divest religious worship as far as possible of every sensible and outward manifestation, Zwingli's radicalism did not go quite so far as that.

The difference in inspiration between his theology and Luther's was to emerge clearly with reference to the doctrine of the Eucharist. The divergence of opinion which in this matter divided the two Reformers was not the result of mere chance. Zwingli had remained a Humanist at heart. If he parted from his old friends, notably from Erasmus, the reason was that his spirit of independence in regard to the Church had proved the stronger. But he still claimed the right, consciously or in effect, to judge every article of belief on its own separate merits rather than as a part of a coherent system of theology, to be accepted or rejected as a whole. In referring to the council of Zurich the duty of deciding between him and Faber or others of his Catholic opponents, he was implicitly acknowledging the untrained prejudices of the man-in-the-street as the judge of the sound interpretation of texts. For it was impossible for him to maintain that the members of the council were qualified by any personal competence in questions of biblical theology. Zwingli's doctrine therefore had a leaven of what the nineteenth century would have called rationalism. Luther was to perceive it in the course of the controversy concerning the Sacraments. It was to

be one more opportunity afforded him of thundering against reason which he coarsely described, in his controversy with Carlstadt concerning the Real Presence, as 'the devil's harlot'.¹

Zwingli rejected, perhaps unconsciously, in the name of what rationalists would have called reason, the doctrine which Luther in the name of the Bible considered sacred, the real, substantial presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

This antagonism between the two Reformers was destined to have serious consequences in the development of Protestantism. It was the most important of the 'variations' in the very beginning of its history. It divided the revolution into two camps. Luther was no more merciful in his dealings with Zwingli and later with Calvin than he was with the Pope whom he identified with Antichrist.

¹ In *Wider die hummlischen Propheten, von den Bildern und Sakrament*, in which reason is continually maltreated and belaboured, Weimar, xviii 62 et seq., and many other works

SOURCES

The main sources for Luther's life are three (a) his *Letters* of which the latest edition is by Enders-Kawerau-Flemming in eighteen volumes, 1884-1920, (b) his *Works* seven collected editions have been published, of which only the last two are now important they are the Erlangen-Frankfort edition in sixty-seven German and twenty-eight Latin volumes, with ten volumes containing miscellaneous additions (1826-86), and the Weimar edition, begun in 1883 and now in its fifty-third volume, but still incomplete, (c) his *Table-talk* which has been carefully collated with recently discovered manuscripts and set out chronologically, thereby becoming an invaluable source for the history of Luther. The former very imperfect record of his conversation was a mere arsenal of weapons in the fight for or against the Reformer. The *Table-talk* or *Tischreden* has been published under the enlightened editorship of Dr Kroker in the Weimar edition and comprises six volumes, separately numbered (1912-21). The works of Melanchthon, Luther's friend and collaborator, were published from 1834 to 1860 in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, the first twenty-eight volumes of that collection. Numerous essays and articles from hitherto unpublished sources have been printed in Germany in learned periodicals and reviews, more particularly since the epoch-making work of the Catholic historians Johannes Janssen and Denifle, notably in the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* and in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte*. The *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte* has also published since 1910 *Supplementa Melanchthoniana*, of which volumes i, ii, v, and vi have so far appeared in Leipzig. A Catholic society has recently been formed to publish the *Corpus Catholicum* containing the works of the Catholic writers of the century of the Reformation thirteen volumes have appeared, since 1919, in Munster-i-W. Cf also the sources indicated at the end of the next chapter. The reader who has only English should consult as sources *First Principles of the Reformation*, the ninety-five theses and three primary works

of Luther, edited with an introduction by H Wace and C A Buchheim, 2nd ed., London, 1896, *The Life of Luther* gathered from his own writings, by Michlet and translated by G H Smith, 1846, Primary works with his shorter and larger Catechisms, edited with essays by H Wace and C A Buchheim, 1896, and Hazlitt's translation of Luther's *Table-talk*, now out of date (1846). A Commentary on Galatians with life, &c, by E Middleton was published in 1864, and *Spiritual Songs* by J H Hunt, in 1853. *The Works of M Luther*, translated and edited by W A Lambert, T T Schindel, &c, 1915—*Luther's Correspondence*, translated and edited by Preserved Smith, 1913–18. *The Life and Letters of M Luther*, by Preserved Smith, 1914.

CHAPTER II

THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF LUTHERANISM AND ZWINGLIANISM

Summary 1 The Development of Lutheranism. 2 The Opposition to Lutheranism
3 The First Diet of Speier, the formation of parties 4 The Second Diet of
Speier, official birth of State Churches. 5 The Confession of Augsburg.
6 The formation of the Schmalka League, beginning of the Wars of religion
7 The Peace of Augsburg.

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF LUTHERANISM

THE methods of propagation of the Lutheran movement differed greatly from those employed in any of the earlier religious movements of history. No preachers of the new gospel went forth to the ends of the earth. Luther limited his own activities to a corner of Germany. He sent no missionaries to conquer the German lands. He cared still less about other countries in Christendom. His principal weapon was the printing press,¹ and it is by the use of the printing press that his story acquires the character of modern history. The Reformer was a prolific writer. He published works which as a rule were short, generally in the vernacular when he wanted to reach the laity, occasionally in Latin when he addressed himself more especially to theologians. He rarely composed treatises which were scientific either in form or intention. He was the king of the pamphlet, the swift, lively, overwhelming booklet, foaming with passionate energy and too often besouled with filthy accusations against his opponents. In a century remarkable for the coarse ribaldry of its controversies, Luther distinguished himself by a licence of expression only too rarely restrained by considerations of propriety. He had no feeling for the incongruity of discussing lofty themes such as faith, salvation, the

¹ Holm Zerener has observed that the booksellers and printers of North Germany were among the first converts to Lutheranism. This was one important factor in Luther's success. *Studien über das beginnende Eindringen der Lutherischen Bibelübersetzung* (1911), p. 4. And yet in spite of it the book-trade was the trade in Germany which later suffered most severely from the spread of Lutheranism and the consequent decline in culture. See Janssen's *History of the German People*. English translation by Christie, vol. III, pp. 361, 362. Kirchoff, I. 79-102. Hase, pp. 388-91.

Gospels, and Christian devotion in a tone of vulgar persiflage spiced with comments of revolting indecency

Despite their curious character or rather, perhaps, because of it, the writings of the Wittenberg theologian were eagerly devoured in all German-speaking countries and sometimes even translated into the languages of neighbouring countries, notably into French.

The bellowings of that tremendous voice found an echo in every part of the country. Monks, preachers, and theologians flocked to him spontaneously and sat at his feet, even without his being aware of it, preached his doctrines, provoked controversies among themselves and drew the attention of the public authorities to their proceedings.

It was on the public authorities that the fate of Lutheranism in the last resort depended.

What we now know as Germany was at the time a sort of mosaic composite of numerous ecclesiastical and lay states and over eighty small republics dignified with the title of Imperial Cities.

Lutheranism, unlike certain other sects such as that of the Anabaptists, which disregarded official opposition or patronage, and emulating the early preachers of the Gospel, sought to make converts by merely preaching their doctrine, always sought and often secured the support of constituted authority. It was of the State from the very beginning and Zwinglianism resembled it in this respect.

It would be no improper reflection upon the governments which gave their adhesion to Lutheranism in its early days to say that their motives were not distinguished for unsullied purity or unadulterated zeal for gospel truth. Their interest was only too apparent. The new doctrine gave them absolute power over the souls of men at the same time as over their bodies. It had an even more tangible result. It destroyed the old ecclesiastical foundations and monasteries and handed over the spoil to the civil ruler. The wealthy burgesses of the towns rejoiced at being delivered from the tutelage of the bishops in the sphere of religion and were happy to enrich their cities with

the pillage of religious houses. Luther's writings gave them every encouragement. He recommended them to employ the revenues they confiscated from the monks in establishing and maintaining schools.¹ His language towards the princes could be exceedingly severe, but he was known to reserve his cruder asperities only for such as turned a deaf ear to his exhortations. The Peasants' Revolt in 1524-5 gave him the opportunity of expressing all the respect he entertained for their authority and the trust he reposed in them for the re-establishment of the threatened social order.²

¹ 'To the Councillors of every City in Germany that it is their duty to erect and maintain Christian schools', early in 1524, Weimar, xv 9-53. It is clear that schools founded as a result of this appeal would almost invariably be replacing schools destroyed when the monasteries were suppressed or deserted. It was a parallel case to that of England a little later when grammar schools were founded under Edward VI and Elizabeth, to make good some part of the loss resulting from the destruction of the monasteries and their schools by their father Henry VIII.

² Compare, e.g., the difference in tone and expression between *Of Secular Authority* (1523) and *Against the pillaging murderous Hordes of the Peasantry* (1525). In the pamphlet of 1523 he said God was striking the princes with madness. They were crazy fools, tyrannizing over the conscience of the people, and their subjects need not obey them. From the beginning of the world a wise prince had been a rare bird, and pious princes seemed rarer. Most of them were the biggest fools and worst scoundrels on earth, and if they did not change their ways God would not suffer them much longer.

In a pamphlet of 1524 *On the Claims of the Peasants*, written soon after the rising began, he took much the same tone. The princes, he declared, had brought the trouble on Germany by their oppression, and they must submit to God's word. It was not the peasants who were fighting against them, but God Himself, on account of their tyranny. The reasonable claims of the peasants should be granted. This was the road to peace. As for the peasants, he told them their grievances did not justify violence, and they should enter into negotiation with their feudal lords.

But in his pamphlet of 1525 he was on the side of the princes. He had completely changed his attitude, and it was a wild cry for vengeance. The peasants, he protested, had deserved death, both of body and soul. Not the magistrates only, but every honest man should take part in destroying them. Every one had the right to be both judge and executioner of a rebel. If one had the chance, one should strangle or stab them, openly or by stealth, as one kills a mad dog. It was no time for mercy, but for the sword. Any one who did not put them to death was a sharer in their wickedness.

Some of his friends expressed their surprise at this violent outburst. He wrote that they had better hold their tongues, for to defend or pity the rebels was to deny and blaspheme God. Not arguments, but blows were the answers for a rebel. 'If', he added, 'they say I am hard and merciless, I answer, mercy be damned! for God's Word says that kings must be honoured, and rebels rooted out. And He is as merciful as we are.'

The 'Lutheran Reformation' spread in this way, with the support of the burgesses of the towns, as early as 1523 to Frankfort-on-Main, Hall in Swabia and Magdeburg, in 1524 to Ulm, Strasburg, Bremen, and Nuremburg. The old religious orders provided recruits. John Lang in Erfurt, Heinrich Moller of Zutphen in Bremen, Link in Altenburg, Guttel in Eisleben, M. Stiefel in Esslingen were all Augustinians like Luther himself.¹ John Eberlin of Gunzburg in Ulm and his colleague, Henry of Kettenbach, had once been Franciscans like Stephen Kempen, the evangelist of Hamburg, John Briesmann, the reformer of Kottbus and Konigsberg, Oswald Geisshussler (Myconius) in Gotha and Weimar. (His missionary zeal was to bring him, a faithful admirer of Calvin, in later years to England.) An ex-Dominican, Martin Bucer, operated in Strasburg, an ex-Carmelite, Urban Regius, in Augsburg. The Benedictines contributed Ambrose Blarer, who worked in Constance, John Oecolampadius (Hausschein), who raised his lamp in Basel, was a Bridgettine. Numbers of the princes showed little less alacrity in adhering to the new order of things.

Meanwhile a political revolt in Sweden ended in a religious revolution and Lutheranism was enthroned in the place of Catholicism. Gustavus Vasa, leader of the patriotic party, was elected King on the 7th June 1523 by the Diet of Strengnas. Strengnas, since 1519, had become the centre of a 'reforming' agitation preached by two brothers, Olaus and Laurentius Petri (Olaf and Lars Peterson), the sons of a blacksmith at Orebro, who had gone to study at Wittenberg and brought the new doctrines back with them. The king needed the wealth of the Church to pay his war debts and restore the finances of the State. He took the brothers Petri under his wing. To destroy the attachment of the Swedish people to the old religion, a disputation was arranged at Upsala on the 27th December 1524. Olaus Petri was the advocate of the Lutheran doctrines against Peter Galle, provost of Upsala, the champion of the old order. In February 1525, Olaus set the Church at defiance by

¹ The Augustinians of Eisleben, Magdeburg, Gotha, and Nuremburg left their monasteries in a body either to preach the new Gospel or to engage in some secular trade.

marrying a wife. The transition to Lutheranism was completed between 1527 and 1531, the year in which Laurentius Petri was consecrated Lutheran archbishop of Upsala¹

Similar changes were about to take place in the German lands, but there the princes were obliged to reckon with the power of the Emperor and the Pope.

2 THE OPPOSITION OF LUTHERANISM

The development of Lutheranism in the years 1522–4 received a powerful impulse through the absence of the Emperor Charles V, wholly absorbed in his desperate struggle with his rival, Francis I. An imperial council governed the German lands in his name, and it was composed of princes dominated by the influence of Frederick of Saxony, now the secret protector of Luther.

Leo X had died on the 1st December 1521. He was succeeded by Adrian VI, a Dutchman from Utrecht, a pontiff of austere character and blameless morals, zealous to reform the Church and equally determined to suppress the growing revolt. He was elected on the 9th January 1522, and at once concerned himself with the affairs of Germany. He could count on the unreserved support of Charles V of whom he had been the tutor, and afterwards the most trusted adviser. Adrian VI sent Francesco Chieregati, an experienced diplomat, as nuncio to the Diet of Nuremberg (17th November 1522–9th February 1523), with the mission of pressing the estates to put down Lutheranism and enforce the Edict of Worms of 1521. But when he informed the estates of the Pope's desires, he was met with the reply (5th February 1523) that any attempt to suppress Lutheranism would provoke a revolution among the populace, unless it were preceded by a correction of the abuses in the

¹ Cf for the Reformation in Sweden Kidd at pp. 151–64 and 233–9, also Hjalmar Holmquist, *Die Schwedische Reformation* (1523–31), No. 139 of the *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte* (1925). Sweden was the first independent sovereign State to go over to Lutheranism and to break with Rome. The Diet of Västerås on the 24th June 1527 passed the *Västerås Ordinans*, twenty-two regulations on the subject of religion, and these were decisive. They were the work of the king and gave him all the power he could wish for over the Church. There was none to oppose his will.

Church which Luther denounced. They demanded the convocation in Germany of a 'free Christian Council', which meant, in Luther's language, 'not subject to the authority of the Pope'. The lay estates went farther still, for they published the *Hundred Complaints of the German Nation* against the Holy See.¹

It was clear that even the princes who were not partisans of Luther considered that his protests against Rome had raised a question which it was important not to leave unanswered and that they reckoned on making use of the 'Lutheran tumult'—the phrase was often on Luther's own lips—to force the Curia to make concessions and a wholesale reform of the abuses which Germany complained of especially in the matter of Roman fiscal exactions.

The worthy Pope Adrian VI died on the 14th September 1523, he was the last non-Italian Pope. There was a return after him for a period to the Renaissance Popes who were at any rate partially distracted by political or worldly pre-occupations from the religious duties of their office. Cardinal Giulio de' Medici, a cousin of Leo X, a prelate of virtuous habits but weak and vacillating character, more like a lay prince than supreme pastor of the Church, succeeded Adrian VI on the 18th November. As Clement VII he felt it necessary to postpone the council, the project of which his pious predecessor had entertained, and he sent to Germany Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, a diplomatist of consummate ability, who had been the first resident nuncio accredited to Germany by Rome and was well acquainted with the situation.

The Diet met again that year at Nuremberg, January 1524. The legate made his entry on the 14th March. But the times had changed. Campeggio did not dare appear himself in his cardinal's robes or give his blessing to the crowd as he made his progress. The city was completely under the influence of the Lutherans Andreas Osiander, the 'evangelist', with the support of the provosts of the churches of St Lawrence and St. Sebald and the protection of the council, had just resolved to introduce the 'Lutheran reform' into the city. The presence

¹ Cf. Kidd, pp. 105-21.

of the legate and the members of the Diet did not deter him from his design. On Maundy Thursday he distributed Holy Communion in both kinds to a congregation which included Isabella of Austria, queen of Denmark, and the Emperor's sister. On the Easter Sunday more than 3,000 men communicated in both kinds. High officials of the court of Ferdinand, the brother and lieutenant-general of Charles V in Germany, mingled in the crowd and publicly displayed their Lutheran sympathies without scruple or restraint.

Such manifestations, however, seem to have had the effect of making clear to the legate and such of the princes as were still Catholic the full extent of the peril. Campeggio demanded the immediate enforcement of the Edict of Worms by the estates. An envoy from the Emperor also intimated His Imperial Majesty's desire to have the Edict enforced. The estates resorted to evasive tactics. They proposed a national synod to meet at Speier on the 11th of November following, with the object of making a settlement of all the religious questions at issue. The legate rejected the proposal. The Emperor was no more disposed to accept it, but took the opportunity to suggest to the Pope the convocation of a General Council at Trent, a city which might well be considered German although it was on the borders of Italy.

Many years were yet to elapse before this salutary project was realized.

The astute Campeggio meanwhile determined to act upon the princes individually. The upshot of his activities was the formation of a Catholic League of which the principal members were the archdukes Ferdinand, the two dukes of Bavaria, and a dozen bishops of southern Germany. The agreement was signed at Ratisbon on the 7th July 1524.¹

The Papal legate had clearly perceived that the best way to check the progress of the revolt was to repress the abuses which had provoked it. The articles of the League of Ratisbon contained a whole programme for the enforcement of canonical discipline among the clergy. Priests were forbidden to frequent

¹ Cf. on all this the documents collected by Kidd, pp. 133-51.

taverns and attend public dances, to keep illegitimate consorts, to give scandal by arranging for elaborate dinner parties in hostellries Rules were prescribed to them for preaching and the administration of the Sacraments They were exhorted to preach the Gospels—a practice which was not the monopoly of the dissenters but was rightly claimed by the Catholics as traditional in the Church, but they were admonished to expound the Scriptures according to the teaching of the great fathers and doctors of the Church of the early centuries, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory

The foundation of such a league was an important event it was the first barrier erected to stem the rising tide of Revolution, a counter-Reformation in miniature Elsewhere a number of incidents occurred to weaken the impetus Lutheranism had gathered in its attempt to conquer the Germanies

Luther, as we have seen, had relied upon the support of the *Ritterschaft*, the Knights, and behind them marched a solid body of Humanists, men who made classical scholarship all but a religion As soon, however, as he felt that he could count upon the protection of his sovereign, he had refused the help of the turbulent gentry who had greeted with such noisy applause his early proceedings against Rome At the same time as the princes attempted to wrest their independence from the Empire and tended to absolute sovereignty in their own States, they endeavoured to reduce the disorderly and needy *Ritterschaft* to the position of mere subjects The reluctance of the Knights to obey was extreme The notorious Franz von Sickingen set them the example of extravagant ambition and bold adventure Early in 1523, he put into practice a lesson learned from Luther's 'Gospel' and proceeded to attack the territory of the archbishop-elector of Trier But the archbishop received the support of his neighbour princes, Sickingen was repulsed and besieged in his last remaining stronghold at Landstuhl and fatally wounded during the siege (May 1523). His allies hastening to his rescue from Hesse and Franconia were intercepted and compelled to surrender The *Ritterschaft* was destroyed beyond hope of recovery as an order within the Empire The influence of

Luther, although he had publicly repudiated such a compromising alliance, received a severe blow from its collapse. It was currently said 'The anti-Emperor (Sickingen) is dead. it will soon be the turn of the anti-Pope to disappear.'

Still lower down in the social scale, Luther's doctrines acting like a leaven on the whole German dough had raised illusory hopes even among a great part of the peasantry, mercilessly ground under the heel of their lords. On hearing the words 'Christian liberty' uttered by the Reformer, the peasants and small farmers had ventured to raise their heads. The *Bundschuh*¹—the name given to the agrarian revolts in Germany from the peasants' adoption as their standard a wooden clog held aloft on a spear—had long been brewing in the country. There had been risings again and again in the course of the fifteenth century.

The rebellion broke out this time, May 1524, on the estates of the abbey of St Blaise, in Swabia. It spread like wildfire. A military leader arose in the person of Hans Muller of Bulgenbach, an old *landsknecht* with a talent for organization. Religious leaders fanned the flames. Balthasar Hubmaier, a friend of Zwingli, who had also taken part in the first disputation of Zurich described above, became their adviser. Thomas Munzer, whom Luther had taken care to expel from Zwickau, inspired them with Anabaptist theories and converted Hubmaier to his doctrine. Ulrich, the dispossessed duke of Wurttemburg, brought them reinforcements and dreamed of making use of them to recover his States. Knights such as Florian Geyer and Gotz von Berlichingen, the hero of Goethe's drama, Gotz of the Iron Hand, willingly led them.² They formulated their grievances and demands in a manifesto entitled *The Twelve Articles*. They claimed the right of appointing their own parish priests, the preaching of 'the Gospel unalloyed', the abolition of serfdom, the right to fish and hunt, to gather wood in the forests, and the restitution of commons (a protest against the enclosure by the lords of the open land around their villages).

¹ i.e. 'League of the Shoe'—the wooden clog or sabot, shaped with a knife and gouge by a village labourer—the characteristic footgear of the peasantry.

² He was so called because he had lost one hand in battle.

The princes and great landlords returned no answer to their demands. Recourse to armed force was inevitable. Then began a tragedy of mingled horror and extravagance. The peasants formed heterogeneous and grotesque associations. The programme drawn up in *The Twelve Articles* was comparatively modest but apocalyptic and communist tendencies soon made their appearance.

The march of the peasants everywhere left behind it a trail of pillage and destruction attended as usual in popular risings of this kind by acts of cruelty and bloodshed. They broke up before the advance of disciplined troops and closed their ranks again when their well-armed and trained opponents had gone by. The Swabian League scattered and hunted them down in the south-west. But the main theatre of hostilities was in Thuringia, where Munzer was more active. The princes, Philip of Hesse and George of Saxony and the elector duke John of Saxony, who had succeeded his brother Frederick on the 5th May, united their forces. On the 15th May 1525 a great battle was fought at Frankenhausen. The peasants were routed and a general slaughter ensued. The revolt was crushed—the smouldering embers were quenched in blood. Munzer was taken prisoner and executed on the 27th May. The devastation of the war was lamentable: over a thousand monasteries and castles had been reduced to ashes, hundreds of villages had been wiped out, fields had been laid waste, the number of victims was incalculable: some accounts estimate the toll of peasants massacred, missing, or banished from their homes at 100,000, others at 150,000: the majority were reduced to ruin and despair. The gloom of desolation oppressed their hearts, while the princes exulted in victory and insolence. The state of society was more depressed and deplorable than ever: the countryside was a desert and had reverted to barbarism.

Luther's attitude throughout these tragic days is easily stated. When the Peasants' Revolt broke out, he used the opportunity thus presented to upbraid the princes for their rejection of the Gospel, that is to say, the Lutheran doctrine. But he vigorously refused to countenance the demands made by

the peasants. When the storm eventually burst, he was seized with an access of rage against the rebels and launched against them one of his most violent tracts, *Against the pillaging murderous Hordes of the peasantry*, May 1525. He compared the insurgents to 'mad dogs' to be ruthlessly exterminated by everybody. He promised Heaven to those who fell in the holy work and ended his diatribe with the outrageous exhortation 'Dear lords, save us, help us, have pity on poor folk *use your swords, your bludgeons and your daggers* all you can. If you die, it is well you cannot die a happier death, for you die in obedience to God, in the service of love, to save your neighbour from Hell and the bonds of Hell'¹

Language of this kind was considered excessive even by Luther's friends, but it was not in the Reformer's character to acknowledge his errors. He answered his critics in a *Letter on the stern little book against the Peasants* which appeared in August 1525 and laid down the principle which is in drastic form, a summary of his governmental policy 'The ass must have blows and the people must be ruled by force. God knew this well, for it was not a fox's brush He gave to rulers but a sword'². Luther had the upstart's contempt for the class from which he sprang.

His comment on the pitiless suppression enforced by the lords was this 'The peasants would not listen they would not even allow a word to be spoken Their ears had to be unstrung by musket blows until their heads flew off into the air That was the birching schoolboys of their sort needed'

His conclusion was plain enough 'If any one is displeased with me, let him be wise and learned, pious and devout in God's name and leave me to my folly and my sin . . . But I want to be left in peace, for nobody shall take anything from me and everything I teach and write must remain true, if the whole world were to burst asunder in consequence'³

If it be true to say that the 'style is the man', Luther has

¹ Weimar, xviii 357-61 Some of Luther's opponents remarked that in his excitement he had forgotten his doctrine that works did not avail to salvation

² Weimar, xviii 396-7

³ Ibid. 401

depicted himself to the life, his harsh, violent character, his intractable obstinacy—in such pamphlets as those from which we have quoted and they are not the most violent in his works. The breach between Lutheranism and the oppressed people was thus consummated and Lutheranism became an instrument of oppression in the hands of the Princes.

Another incident took place about the same time which contributed to deprive Luther of the halo of prophet and national saint which his revolt against the Roman Curia had earned him. At the height of the Peasants' Revolt, on the 13th June 1525, he married Catherine von Bora. The woman had been a nun in a Cistercian convent, one of nine who had renounced their vows.

At last the Humanists by the pen of Erasmus intimated the disgust they felt for a doctrine which considered the degradation of human nature to be the only way of glorifying God.

Erasmus' book was issued in August 1524, from the press of John Froben in Basel. It was entitled *Diatribe seu Collatio de Libero Arbitrio* and vigorously attacked the theology of Luther:

They exaggerate original sin out of all proportion [wrote Erasmus]. They maintain that the highest faculties of human nature have been so corrupted by original sin that, left to itself, it can only hate or ignore God and even a person justified by grace can accomplish no work which is not a sin. To listen to them, the very inclination to evil bequeathed to us by the sin of our first parents is itself a sin and invincible to such an extent that there is no commandment of God which man even justified by faith can possibly fulfil. The sole object of the many commandments which God imposed on us would seem to be merely the manifestation of the divine favour which grants us salvation without any consideration of merits. The truth is they seem to me to limit the divine mercy on one point only in order to expand it on another like a host who should offer a very meagre luncheon simply in order to appear the more magnificent at dinner . . . They represent God as an ogre by making Him practise such cruelty against the whole human race for a sin, for which those who committed it have done such a complete and lengthy penance. Moreover, in teaching that those who have been justified by faith simply sin, so that loving God and reposing our trust in Him we incur the divine

hatred, they surely surprisingly restrict the grace which justifies man by faith but nevertheless abandons him completely to sin

Erasmus went on to point out the inherent contradiction in maintaining on the one hand that the righteous man, deprived of all free will, is guided solely by the Holy Ghost, and on the other that he is nevertheless steeped in sin, as though the Holy Ghost could cohabit with sin. He accused Luther of being *extravagant* in everything. The preachers of Indulgences sold the merits of the saints. Luther, on the other hand, stripped the saints of all merit and declared that everything they had done was merely sinful, deserving eternal damnation!

Luther replied to his critic in a ponderous Latin work which he later regarded as his masterpiece the *De Servo Arbitrio*, 'On the Bondage of the Will', published on the 31st December 1525¹

In it he maintained with his characteristic obstinacy his cherished thesis of absolute fatalism 'Whatever we do', he wrote, 'whatever happens, however contingent it may appear to us to be, is done and happens in virtue of an unchangeable necessity.' And again: 'Free-will is a divine attribute and therefore properly applicable only to the divine Majesty . . . To attribute it to man is to deify him and no greater sacrilege can be committed'

The most curious thing in such a theory was the claim to maintain the sense of responsibility in man and at the same time strip him of all free will. How could man be reasonably held guilty of sins which he was not free to avoid? And if he was to be debited with sins, by what right was he to be refused the credit of his meritorious actions? If he is liable to demerit, why should he not be capable also of merit? If he is worthy of Hell, without his will having a free choice of his deeds, why should he not also be worthy of Heaven? Luther had cursed reason again and again. Reason took its revenge by absenting itself from his mind and his writings. Taube, a Protestant historian, has summed up this famous dispute in the following words: 'Erasmus is fighting for responsibility, duty, culpability and penance, concepts which are the constituent elements of

¹ Weimar, xviii 600-787

Christian morality . . . he is doing battle against a fatalism which is irreconcilable with such morality, a point which only Luther's lack of logic prevented him from seeing Erasmus is doing battle for the moral character of the Christian religion'¹

The breach between the Humanists and Lutheranism was complete. The separation of the elements was thus achieved by the force of circumstances and Lutheranism gradually assumed its permanent character and definitive position

3 THE FIRST DIET OF SPEIER THE FORMATION OF PARTIES

The formidable Peasants' Revolt drove the Catholic princes of north Germany to conclude a common agreement. On the 19th July 1525, George the Bearded, duke of Saxony, the electors Albert of Mainz and Joachim of Brandenburg, Eric, duke of Brunswick-Calenberg, and Henry, duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbuttel, formed the *League of Dessau*, 'to extirpate the root cause of this trouble, the accursed Lutheran faction'.

The Lutheran princes, the elector John of Saxony and the landgrave Philip of Hesse were not inactive. On the 2nd May 1526 they formed the *League of Torgau*, which grew by the adhesion on the 12th June at Magdeburg of the Brunswick-Luneburg dukes, Otto, Ernest, and Francis, Philip, duke of Brunswick-Grubenhagen, Henry, duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt-Kothen, and Counts Gebhard and Albert of Mansfeld. The city of Magdeburg joined the League on the 25th June.

Therefore, when the Diet of Speier assembled on the 25th June under the presidency of Ferdinand of Austria, the Emperor's brother, the opposing camps had been already pitched. Catholics and Lutherans were alike bound by formal and opposing agreements

A letter dated the 23rd March 1526, from Charles V, was read to the Diet forbidding the authorization of any innovation in religious discipline until a General Council should have been summoned. This was the Catholic proposal and it received a majority of votes. But the cities, with the secret support of the

¹ Taube, *Luthers Lehre über Freiheit*, Göttingen, 1901, p. 46

Lutheran princes, came forward on the 1st August with a list of complaints against the clergy and abuses of the traditional religious practice. They demanded the suppression of convents and religious orders, the confiscation of their property and the abolition of the Mass. These demands provoked a lively discussion. The cities called attention to the fact that a state of hostilities existed between the Pope and the Emperor—they had just heard of the formation on the 22nd May 1526 of the *League of Cognac* uniting France, the Pope, England, Venice, Florence, and Milan against Charles V, so that the hope of a General Council once again became illusory. Something had to be done but the Diet was divided on the course to be pursued. The Lutherans made a public profession of their contempt for the precepts of the Church by openly eating flesh meat on days of abstinence and staying away from Mass. Nevertheless rumours of the Turkish invasion under Solyman began to pervade the German lands. By force of circumstances the Lutherans came to regard the Turks and later the French also as their natural allies. Ferdinand of Austria became apprehensive that the estates might adjourn without having come to any definite resolution. He therefore proposed on the 27th August the Recess of the Diet wherein it was enacted (i) that no innovation should be introduced, (ii) that a General Council or National German Council should be convoked within a year or eighteen months, (iii) that 'with regard to the Edict of Worms, the princes and the cities pledged themselves in a common agreement so to live, govern, and comport themselves as they should answer for their conduct to God and His Imperial Majesty'.

Such an ambiguous form of expression was interpreted by the Lutherans as their interests dictated. Circumstances were strongly in their favour. The Emperor on the one hand was absorbed in his struggle with the Pope, which was to end on the 6th May 1527, in the appalling Sack of Rome, and with his war against France. The Turks on the other hand had crushed the Christian armies under the command of Louis II, king of Bohemia and Hungary, on the field of Mohacz (29th–30th

August 1526), Louis II was killed in the battle. Ferdinand of Austria, the heir to both thrones through his wife, Anne of Poland, deemed it prudent to have himself crowned king of Bohemia at Prague (24th February 1527)¹ and of Hungary at Stuhlweissenburg (3rd November), where his rival had been elected the previous year. Ferdinand considered the Turkish menace as for the time more urgent and important for him than the Lutheran agitation.

Philip of Hesse was the first to recognize and take advantage of this situation. On the 20th October 1526 he summoned the *Synod of Homberg*, which adopted a radical plan for a democratic form of Church government elaborated by an ex-Franciscan François Lambert of Avignon. But Philip, on Luther's advice substituted for Lambert's Presbyterian principle of the independence of every parish² the State Establishment which had been instituted in Saxony, and with the spoil of the monasteries and of convents founded a Lutheran university at Marburg which rivalled Wittenberg.

In 1525 Lutheranism had already penetrated into Prussia beyond the confines of the Empire. The margrave, Albert of Brandenburg, who as Grand-Master of the Teutonic Order governed east Prussia, had taken Luther's advice and married a wife, secularized his States, and constituted them a hereditary duchy under the suzerainty of Poland (9th April 1525). The property of the Order included the territories of two dioceses of Samland and Ermland, and their two bishops were the first to adhere to Lutheranism. On the 29th September 1526 the new duke of Prussia joined the League of Torgau.³

The duchy of Brunswick-Lüneburg adopted the Lutheran system in 1527, while of the cities, Brunswick followed suit in 1528, Hamburg in 1529, and Lübeck in 1531.

All these changes had the following features in common: the

¹ The anniversary of Pavia two years earlier and the birthday of Charles V.

² Lambert's idea was later carried out in the 'free' churches of Scotland, England, France, and America. The German Reformers, on the other hand, preferred a church in which authority on dogma and discipline should rest not with the congregation but with the Sovereign.

³ Cf. Kidd, pp. 188-92.

religious orders were suppressed and their property confiscated, the Mass was abolished or a profoundly altered ritual substituted, images and pictures and crucifixes were mostly consigned to the flames. But the new regulations varied from city to city and from State to State in detail, if not in spirit. Particularism was triumphant all along the line.

At this juncture a trifling incident nearly set a spark to the gunpowder. A certain Otto Pack, a former vice-chancellor of Duke George of Saxony, reported to the landgrave of Hesse the formation in Breslau of an alleged offensive league of Catholics for the extirpation of Lutheranism. The landgrave immediately called his Lutheran allies to arms; the elector of Saxony had the utmost difficulty in quieting him. The Catholics, apprised of what was happening, indignantly protested against Pack's lies and forgeries. Philip agreed to acknowledge that he had been deceived, but eminently practical in policy, insisted on the ecclesiastical principalities in his neighbourhood, the bishops of Salzburg, Wurzburg, and Bamberg, defraying the costs of the mobilization he had ordered against them (1528).

4. THE SECOND DIET OF SPEIER OFFICIAL BIRTH OF STATE CHURCHES

The reconciliation of the Pope and the Emperor enabled the Catholic forces to turn about and counter-attack. Charles of Bourbon had marched on Rome. He was shot dead while escalading the wall. But his followers—an army of mercenary adventurers largely composed of German Lutherans—sacked the city. The Pope held out for a while in the castle of St Angelo but had to surrender. The victorious Charles V had entered into negotiations with the Pontiff, restored him to his States and come to an understanding with him for the suppression of heresy.

The Emperor thereupon convoked a new Diet at Speier. It assembled on the 15th March 1529, under the presidency of Ferdinand of Austria. The opening declaration condemned the Recess of 1526 as null and void on account of its having been, from the very outset, wrongly interpreted by the Lutherans.

LUTHERANISM AND ZWINGLIANISM

The Declaration condemned all innovations introduced in t
interval and called for a General Council to be held in the ne
future. The tone of this declaration alarmed the cities. Th
feared that the Emperor was about to reimpose the episcop
jurisdiction regarding the appointment of preachers and oth
ministers which town councils in many places had arrogated
themselves. They roused fierce opposition. The agents of t
king of France, inaugurating a policy destined to last as long
the rivalry between the two houses of France and Austr
fomented the antagonism between the estates whose relatio
were already violently embittered by the Pack incident.

The Recess¹ of the Diet was finally drawn up, accepted by t
imperial commissioners and promulgated on the 19th April.
was a very moderate proposal, an attempt to secure a tempora
truce till peace could be restored in Germany. It was to t
effect that in those States and cities where there had been a mo
or less general adoption of the new religion no one should l
troubled on that account; but that until a General Coun
could meet and settle all disputes no further changes in religio
should be made, and meanwhile in places where there was
Catholic minority these should not be prevented by the Luthera
from having Mass said and being present at it.

This Recess would have provided the Lutheran churches wi
a more effective legal basis than the Recess of 1526, but t
Lutheran princes refused to accept even such a moderate pr
posal and on the same day presented the famous *Protest* fro
which their name of Protestants is derived². They proclaimed
their strong desire to abide by the Recess of 1526 with the co
struction they had given to it. On the 25th April they added
to their Protest an appeal from the Diet to the Emperor, to t
next General Council of Christendom or to a congress of
the German nation in which the following passage occurred: ']
matters involving the honour of God, the salvation and etern

¹ 'Recess' was the term used to describe the final resolution in which a Diet adjourning served up its chief decisions.

² Here in England there is a widespread popular idea that Protestants are called on account of their Protest against Roman errors. But it was in effect a protest against toleration and freedom for Catholics to retain their religion.

life of souls, every man must stand by himself and account to God for his own conduct and no one can excuse himself by the action or resolution of another' 'It reads like a declaration of the freedom of conscience', the Protestant historian Philippson very pertinently observes, but the reader is cruelly undeceived when he sees that the Protestant States asserted this liberty only for themselves and evinced the same cruelty as their opponents of the old religion in persecuting any one of their subjects who claimed the right 'to stand before God by himself'.¹ Five princes, the elector John of Saxony, the margrave George of Brandenburg-Culmbach, the landgrave Philip of Hesse, the dukes Ernest and Francis of Brunswick-Luneburg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, and fourteen cities, Strassburg, Nuremberg, Ulm, Constance, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nordlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny, St Gall, Wissenburg, and Windsheim signed the famous Protest of Speier.

As early as the 22nd April a close and secret league bound a number of these cities together. It formed the nucleus of the Schmalkaldic League. The Lutherans might perhaps have resorted at once to acts of violence had it not been for a combination of circumstances unfavourable to their cause. The Emperor was on the point of bringing the war with France to an end. The Protestant party, on the other hand, was divided by the antagonism between Luther and Zwingli, and Luther had not yet made up his mind that war against the Emperor was permitted by Holy Scripture. It was to take him two years to come to such a conclusion.

Luther was, indeed, as often as not, a thorn in the flesh of the Protestant League. Philip of Hesse, the only statesman in the league, would have brushed aside the scruples of the theologian, but Luther, strong in the support of the elector of Saxony, who was disinclined for rash adventures, steadily opposed him.

Philip's great ambition was to unite all the Protestant forces, and on his urgent entreaty the two leaders, Luther and Zwingli, met in solemn disputation in his castle of Marburg to settle the 'sacramental' problem. The debate took place on the last day

¹ Philippson, *Geschichte der neuren Zeit*, Berlin, 1 190

of September 1529. Zwingli maintained that the words of Our Lord, '*This is My Body*' meant no more than 'This represents My Body', as when a man says, 'This is Socrates', all he means is 'This is a picture of Socrates'. Oecolampadius, the Reformer of Basel, shared his view. Luther replied that to give a symbolical interpretation to words so clear in meaning was like going up a blind alley 'Do you also see a symbol in the words "*He ascended into Heaven*"? Why not?' To every objection alleged by his opponents, he merely answered with the words '*This is My Body*'. No agreement was come to in regard to the question of the Real Presence after three days' discussion, and by the Articles of Schwabach, 16th October 1529, the Zwinglians were excluded from all association with the pure Lutherans.

5 THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG

The year 1529 had seen the end of the serious anxieties which had hampered the Catholic party. The Turks had invaded Austria. Solymán the Magnificent had sworn to capture Vienna. But the Emperor had hastened to conclude a binding treaty of peace with the Pope, Clement VII (the Treaty of Barcelona, 29th June 1529), and then ended the war with France by the Treaty of Cambrai (the Ladies' Peace, 5th August). Solymán, after capturing Buda-Pesth, had pushed on to the attack on Vienna. But he was repulsed by the brilliant defence of the garrison and the valour of the citizens, and, disheartened by the epidemics which ravaged his army, he was forced to retreat on the 16th October. Charles V then made peace with Milan and Venice at Bologna in December, and victorious over all his enemies, received the Iron Crown of Lombardy from the hands of the Pope on the 22nd February 1530, and the Imperial Crown of the Romans two days later. He then determined to return to Germany after nine years' absence, his second visit to his German dominions, in the hope of putting an end to the religious conflict which had continued since the Diet of Worms.

The terms of his message convening the Diet of Augsburg represented him as willing to offer his arbitration between Catholics and Protestants and exhorted both alike to an ideal

unity of belief which was far removed from fact. He entered Augsburg on the 15th June 1530. His first disappointment was a definite refusal by the Protestant princes to take part with him in the Corpus Christi procession. He began by forbidding any priest to preach in the town, unless he had received the Emperor's personal authorization. He then invited the Protestants to state their point of view. They had come prepared for this. Melanchthon had drawn up a 'Confession of Faith' which Luther, who was still theoretically under the ban of the Empire and could come no nearer the Diet than the castle of Coburg, had seen and approved, although he considered its tone too diplomatically cautious. This 'Confession' was presented on the 25th June. It bore the signature of seven princes and two imperial cities, Nuremberg and Reutlingen. The 'Confession of Augsberg' sets forth in two parts (1) the main articles of faith, and (2) a statement of abuses in the Church requiring amendment.

Part I is divided into twenty-two paragraphs, the more important of which are those dealing with original sin, which is identified with concupiscence (§ 2), justification by faith alone without good works (§ 4), the Church defined as 'the congregation of the Saints in which the Holy Gospel is properly taught and the Sacraments properly administered' (§ 7), and the *Sacraments, the efficacy of which is held to depend upon the faith of the recipient* (§ 13).

Melanchthon had modified Luther's doctrine on a number of points. He had insisted upon the condemnation of the Anabaptists, who were regarded, not without reason, as dangerous and anarchical revolutionaries. They were the anarchists of the time. He declared that justification, although independent of good works, still required or implies good works. The obviously immoral consequences of the doctrine were to be thereby avoided.

One passage in the Confession on justification should be noticed. 'The whole of this doctrine', it is declared, 'is to be taken in connexion with the (interior) struggle of the terrified conscience and cannot be understood without regard to that struggle . . . Devout and timid consciences hence derive great

consolation, for they cannot be restored to tranquillity by any good work, but only by the faith which assures them that the wrath of God is appeased, as so far as they are concerned, by the blood of Christ' (§ 20)

The text is suggestive. It contains the essence of Lutheranism. The *mal du siècle*, the disease of the age, was the terror of the conscience faced with the idea of an avenging God and haunted by the uncertainty of salvation, which theories of arbitrary predestination produced.

Part II of the Confession set out in seven sections the abolition of Communion in both kinds, of clerical celibacy, of private Masses, of auricular confession, of the observance of days of fasting and abstinence, of monastic vows, and of alleged usurpations by ecclesiastical authority.

Melanchthon affected to believe that Protestantism expresses the tradition of the primitive Church and reproduced more particularly the doctrine of St Augustine concerning justification. In this, however, he was fundamentally disingenuous, and a scholar of to-day who behaved in such a fashion would be utterly discredited. About the end of May 1531 he wrote to John Brenz, under Luther's signature, as follows.

Personally, I quote Augustine as completely on our side on account of public opinion with regard to him, although he gives an inadequate account of justification by faith. Believe me, my dear Brenz, the controversy concerning the justice of faith is complicated and obscure. You will realize it, if you turn your eyes away completely from the law and fix your mind firmly on the 'gratuitous promise' so as to grasp that it is by the promise and through Christ that we are justified and pleasing in the sight of God and so find peace. I have endeavoured to explain this doctrine in my 'Apology'. But my enemies have calumniated me so that it is impossible to speak therein as I now speak to you, although it is fundamentally the same thing.¹

Melanchthon and Luther were therefore well aware that the high authority of St. Augustine was against them. The whole of the letter to John Brenz proves this. But, as Melanchthon

¹ Enders, ix. 18-21.

again observed 'it is impossible to understand such matters except in regard to the *struggles of conscience*', and he continued, tearing the veil from the secret religious policy of Lutheranism '*As for the populace, they must have the law and repentance preached to them.*' Thorough-going Lutheranism was a religion reserved for the use of the privileged few. It was sought to retain the support of the populace by a measured and unavowed return to certain Catholic practises.

Charles V had the Confession refuted by a commission of twenty theologians working under his eyes. Their Confutation was presented to the Diet on the 3rd August. Philip of Hesse at once went away without any leave takings. Great agitation prevailed in the Protestant camp. The Emperor, anxious for an understanding at all costs in view of the immminence of the Turkish peril, was disposed to be conciliatory. He arranged for disputations to be held between the theologians on both sides but these were barren of result. The Protestants rejected every Catholic suggestion and presented an *Apology for the Confession*, again drawn up by Melanchthon. Four cities—Strasburg, Memmingen, Constance, and Lindau—drew up a Confession of their own inspired by Zwinglian principles, and presented it in their turn to the Diet. Bucer and Capito were the responsible authors of this *Confessio Tetrapolitana* (or Four City Statement), as it was called, from the four signatory cities.

On the 22nd September the Recess of the Diet was voted. Dissenters were given until the 15th April to make up their minds whether they would conform or not; if, after that date, they refused to return to Catholic unity, steps would be taken to compel them by due process of *law*.

Such threats, which in view of renewed anxieties for the Empire from the Turks on the one hand and the French on the other could not be effectively carried out, merely hastened the transformation of Protestantism into a political party in arms.

6. THE FORMATION OF THE SCHMALKALDIC LEAGUE. THE BEGINNING OF THE WARS OF RELIGION

At the instigation of Philip of Hesse, the one statesman with a policy in the Protestant camp, the dissenters hastened to transform their league into an offensive and defensive alliance. Luther and his friends had at last discovered that the precept inculcating obedience to civil authority had no application to the Emperor, because he was an elected sovereign, but only to the princes, because theirs was a hereditary title by divine right. Early in 1531 he published a *Warning to his beloved Germans*,¹ setting out his new theory and casting the responsibility beforehand on the Catholics if war should result. The Lutheran Revolution thereby completely assumed its historical character; it was feudal and of the middle class. It had begun to organize itself politically and militarily at Christmas 1530. The election of Ferdinand on the 5th January 1531 to be king of the Romans hastened its organization. A second reunion was held on the 27th February and the Protestant League was formally constituted at Schmalkalden, a small Hessian town in Thuringia. Its importance arose not so much from the number as from the various interests represented by its members and their geographical distribution. There were princes and cities, Lutherans and Zwinglians—for necessity had united those who had been enemies the day before—principalities of north and south Germany. Two of the most important estates were in the very centre of the league, the electorate of Saxony and the land-gravate of Hesse. They were treated as equal. The ruler of one or the other of these was to have supreme command if the seat of war was in his territory or contiguous thereto.

The defeat and death of Zwingli in October 1531 favoured the development of the new power by detaching the towns of the south-west from the Swiss confederation.

Zwingli had returned from the conference at Marburg with the belief that he had won Philip of Hesse to his ideas. The thought of it had filled him with pride, although the Landgrave

¹ Weimar, *Warnung an seine liebe Deutschen*, xxx 3, 252 et seq.

had merely deemed it prudent not to show his hand. The Swiss Reformer then began to urge the city council of Zurich along the path of adventure. He also had taken up a definite position of antagonism to the Anabaptists and turned the situation to account by expelling all dissenters and declaring war on Catholicism. A preliminary war had broken out in June 1529 between Zurich and the five neighbouring Catholic cantons, but a timely intervention had put an end to hostilities. The following year, at Zwingli's instigation, Zurich seized the abbey of St Gall, expelled the monks, and annexed their territory. A number of cantons protested to Zurich. Zwingli's answer was to turn St. Gall into a Protestant democracy. In May 1531 he caused all commercial relations with the five Catholic Forest cantons to be broken off because they had dared to oppose the schemes and policy of Zurich. This crippled their trade and cut off some of their food supplies. So the war began. Zurich could only put a small force of 2,500 men in the field against nearly 8,000 warlike mountaineers. Zwingli marched bravely at the head of the Zurich levies. The battle was fought on the 11th October, near Kappel, and the men of Zurich were routed. Zwingli was among the dead. The result of the conflict was to isolate Zwinglianism from Germany and to perpetuate its separate development. Protestantism was becoming more and more divided into compartments.

Luther exulted in public at the death of his enemy. He hailed it as 'a judgement from God'.

The Schmalkaldic League received a constitution in December 1531 at Frankfurt and in April 1532 had completed its organization at Schweinfurt. Francis I, king of France, had sent its ambassadors and concluded with it at the same time a treaty 'for the defence of German liberty'. For, seen from the court of France and with the eyes of diplomats whose self-seeking policy left religious considerations out of account, the Reformation had assumed the aspect only of a revolt against the Emperor. It was treated as a move in the political game. But even some of the Catholic principalities of Germany, alarmed at the increasing aggrandizement of the house of Habsburg, evinced

only a moderate ardour in the Emperor's cause. The German lands thenceforward had another focal point than the Diet. The Protestant League was turning into a *State within a State*.

It was from the outset in a position to deal with the Emperor on a footing of equality. The Turkish peril, which had been such a heavy drag on the whole religious development of Germany, became again so threatening that the Emperor was compelled to conclude a truce with the Protestants known to history as the *Religious Peace of Nuremberg* (23rd July 1532), on the following conditions: the estates were to extend a mutual toleration to each other in religious matters, all suits against the Protestants pending before the Reichskammergericht (the Imperial Court of Justice) were to be quashed: a General Council was to be convoked in the near future which was to be 'free, universal, and Christian'. (The terms were ambiguous and the Lutherans used the ambiguity as a pretext to reject the proposal for a Council at Trent.)

Once Solyman was forced to retreat, Charles V left Germany again for nine years. The Convocation of a Council was the Pope's concern.¹ Absorbed in the struggle with France, in the war in the East, in suppressing a revolt in the Netherlands, he left the field free for the Schmalkaldic allies. The progress made by the league was swift and noteworthy. In 1532 the three princes of Anhalt-Dessau invited a Lutheran preacher, one Nicholas Haussmann, to Dessau. The country went over to the Reformation in 1534. It triumphed that same year in Nassau, Frankfort-on-the-Main, and Augsburg. The intrigues of Philip of Hesse about the same time were successful in restoring the duke Ulrich of Württemburg to his States. The Austrians were driven out (12–13th May) and the country promptly reformed. This meant everywhere the same thing: the Mass was abolished, the practice of the Catholic religion was prohibited, the property of religious houses was confiscated, clerical celibacy was banned, monastic vows were dispensed with. On the other hand, the rival tendencies dividing German Protestantism, the one

¹ And indeed is. Cf. St. Thomas, *Sum. Theol.* 2^a, 2^{ae}, 1. 10. 2. The explanation of the delay is that the Pope's efforts were persistently frustrated by the lay princes.

inspired by Luther, the other by Bucer, who favoured the Zwinglians, were reconciled by the Concord of Wurttemburg, 2nd August 1534.

Pomerania was also won to the Reformation by the preaching of John Bugenhagen, an associate of Luther's, in the course of the year 1534-1535.

Germany was set on fire for a moment by the Anabaptist crisis. The disciples of Thomas Munzer had disappeared for the time being after the crushing of the Peasants' Revolt in 1525. Their doctrine, nevertheless, continued to be preached and propagated in secret. They felt themselves strong enough to attack Munster, where the newly-elected bishop, Count Franz von Waldeck, an unworthy prelate, was unpopular. Their leader, a certain Jan Beuckelssen, or Bockelsohn, popularly known as Jan of Leyden, where he had kept an inn—he was a journeyman tailor to his trade and as such had travelled over Europe—succeeded in driving out the bishop and his priests. He set up in the town what he described as 'the kingdom of Zion', the main features of which were communism and polygamy. There followed a perfect frenzy of unmentionable debaucheries and the pitiless slaughter of their opponents by the 'saints' (30th August 1534). Anabaptism triumphed also for a time at Lubeck, where Wullenwever led the revels. The Catholics were not slow to blame Luther for these disorders, while the Lutherans engaged with renewed zeal in the fight against the revolutionaries. Munster was taken by assault on the night of the 24th June 1535, and Jan of Leyden tortured to death in the market-place. The revolt was crushed with the usual merciless massacre. Two years later the Anabaptists were cleared out of Lubeck. Wullenwever fell into the hands of the archbishop of Bremen, was handed over to the archbishop's brother, Duke Henry of Brunswick, and duly dispatched in September 1537.

The Schmalkaldic League received a fresh accession of strength in 1539 by the adhesion of the duchy of Saxony (which George the Bearded, who had died on the 16th April 1539, had hitherto retained in allegiance to the old religion) and, in 1540, of the electorate of Brandenburg.

Outside Germany, Denmark, Norway, and Iceland passed over to Lutheranism in the course of the years 1537 to 1540.

The Lutheran danger had now assumed such a menacing aspect that the Emperor considered his presence in Germany once more necessary. He returned in January 1541. There seemed to him to be still some hope of effecting a reconciliation and a return to religious unity. The scandal which Philip of Hesse had caused by marrying, with the approval of the Wittenberg theologians, Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer, a second wife at Rothenburg on 4th March 1540, had brought discredit on the Schmalkaldic League, and Philip had made advances to the Emperor with a view to obtaining immunity for his crime, the legal penalty of which was death. In Brandenburg also, a tendency had been observed to describe a middle course between strict Lutheranism and Catholicism. The Emperor believed that if both sides were to make concessions a mutual understanding might in the end be achieved. He therefore embarked upon the policy of *Colloquies* or Conferences. Protestant and Catholic theologians met in debate at Haguenau in 1540, at Worms in January 1541, and again at Ratisbon in April–May of that same year. Never did an agreement seem so near. But Luther, still under the ban of the Empire and kept outside these conferences, displayed the greatest reluctance to come to any understanding. The theologians of his party, moreover, evinced no inclination to acknowledge the authority of the Church, and finally the agents of the king of France strove their utmost to keep the German rulers in a state of disunion so advantageous to the interests of their country. The conversations, therefore, led to nothing.

The years which followed were taken up with a double war waged by the Emperor against Francis I on the one hand and the Turks on the other. The Protestants availed themselves of the opportunity thus presented to fortify their position. The secularizations carried out at one time by bishops who had gone over to Lutheranism, at another by the usurpations by Lutheran princes of the territories of such bishops as remained Catholic, continually altered the religious map of Germany. The

Lutherans were hoping thus to annex the two electorates of Mainz and Cologne. This would disturb the Constitution of the Empire. If four electors in seven were Protestant, the imperial crown would inevitably be lost to the Habsburgs. The danger was so pressing that the Emperor determined to have recourse to arms.

Luther had died on the 18th February 1546. His last days darkened by failing health and much physical and mental suffering, protesting to the end that he had brought the Papacy to ruin, but at the same time lamenting the endless divisions of the Reformers and the irreligion and lawlessness of so many of their followers.¹

Charles V found in Maurice of Saxony a man readily disposed to betray the Lutheran party, and on the 26th June made a compact with him. Bavaria promised to help. The Pope furnished subsidies. Without consulting the Diet, the Emperor issued a decree placing the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse under the Ban of the Empire. On the 27th October he transferred the electorate of Saxony to his ally, Maurice, and sent him to overrun the country. The deaths early in 1547 of Francis I and Henry VIII² deprived the Protestants of all hope of foreign assistance. The victory of Muhlberg on the Elbe, 24th April 1547, made Charles V master of Germany.

He then committed the capital error of resorting only to half

¹ The end was near when he wrote that the people 'were plunging headlong to the devil', and he went on to say

'We dwell in Sodom and Babylon, and things are worse every day. It is the general complaint—and alas! too true—that the young people are utterly dissolute and disorderly and will not be taught any more. They do not even know what God's Word is, or Baptism, or the Lord's Supper. Sin of all kinds is rampant. Who amongst us would have thought of preaching as we have done, if we could have foreseen how much misery, corruption, scandal, blasphemy, and wickedness would have resulted from it?'

He talked of leaving Wittenberg. 'I would rather', he wrote, 'spend my poor last days in begging my bread than in beholding the wickedness of Wittenberg, and in the bitter reflection that all my labour and pains have been utterly thrown away.' But if Wittenberg was bad, Leipzig was worse. 'They are bent on being damned well, let them have their wish', wrote Luther.

² Henry VIII had broken with the Holy See and made himself the head of a separated 'Church of England', but specifically Protestant doctrine was not introduced until the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth.

measures He forgot that where religion is involved compromises can never be successful The history of Arianism in the fourth century should have inspired him with a wholesome mistrust of courtier prelates He sought to impose on the whole Empire a religious constitution known as the *Interim of Augsburg*. He displeased everybody. The Pope accused him of usurping ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Protestants clamoured that they were being oppressed. The Emperor's own brother, Ferdinand, became anxious as to the designs which Charles V harboured for regulating in advance the succession to the Empire.

There was a reversal of the political situation when Maurice of Saxony, perpetrating a second act of treachery, entered into negotiations with France and by the Treaty of Chambord, 15th January 1552, offered Henry II in return for his support against the Emperor the territories of the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun Henry II, like his father, assumed the title of 'Protector of the liberties of Germany and its captive princes'. Maurice of Saxony suddenly marched on Augsburg and entered the town on the 4th April 1552. The Emperor had only a few troops to oppose to him and was compelled to make a precipitate flight in rain and snow across the Brenner His courage failed him and he left his brother Ferdinand the task of settling the conflict.

The Treaty of Passau on the 2nd August 1552, completed three years later by the *Peace of Augsburg*, 25th September 1555, regulated the situation in Germany until the Thirty Years War¹

7. THE PEACE OF AUGSBURG

The main provisions of the Peace were as follows (1) The States belonging to the Confession of Augsburg were thenceforward to enjoy absolute liberty in regard to their 'beliefs, liturgy, and ceremonies'. (2) They were, on the other hand, to respect such States as had retained the old religion and suffer them to enjoy to the full their rights, privileges, and territories.

(3) All ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the States adhering to the Confession of Augsburg in regard to doctrine, the appointment

¹ Cf Kidd, pp 363-4.

of ministers, the customs of churches, orders and ceremonies was thenceforth to cease and governments were to be free to control all such matters as they pleased, until the final regulation of religious affairs. (4) One of the most important provisions has been described as the *ecclesiastical reservation* Article 19 of the Treaty confirmed every secularization which had taken place before the Treaty of Passau in 1552. But Article 18 enacted that thenceforth *If any Archbishop, Bishop, Prelate, or other priest abandoned THE old religion, then and in every such case his Archbischopric, Bishopric, Prelacy, or other benefice, and all the emoluments thereto attached, should be forthwith resigned by him without objection or delay.* An embargo was thereby placed on any further secularizations. The numerous violations of this article by the Protestants were to be among the principal causes of the fearful conflict of the Thirty Years War.

The Peace of Augsburg barred for centuries the prospect of seeing religious unity restored in Europe. The principle of unity, the first postulate of the divine truth of the Christian religion, became a principle practically contradicted by new theories. Religious toleration made its first appearance in international law. It was restricted, however, within the limits of the Catholic religion and the Confession of Augsburg, Article 17 expressly prohibiting any other forms of religion, but it was none the less a remarkable innovation. Local toleration, on the other hand, was not yet established. The princes were still free to expel all dissenters from their States. But Article 24 empowered Catholics or Lutherans, who quitted their country voluntarily or by constraint, to sell their property without incurring any fine or attainder.

It was, as has been observed, the recognition of the maxim *Cujus regio, ejus religio*. Religion was to be that of the ruler of the realm. The definite result of what is known as the Reformation was an ending of the religious unity of Europe, officially recognized by the secular power.

SOURCES

P. Balan, *Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae ex tabularius S. Sedis secretis*, Ratisbon, 1883-4, covering only the period from 1521 to 1525, and by the same historian,

Monumenta saeculi XVI historiam illustrantia, Innsbruck, 1885 Th Brieger, *Aleand und Luther*, *Die vervollständigten Aleander-Depeschen nebst Untersuchungen über den Wormser Reichstag*, Gotha, 1884 Ehses, *Concilium Tridentinum*, vol iv his introduction contains many important documents *Deutsche Reichstagsahnen, Jungere Serie* published by the Historical Commission of the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Gotha, 1893 et seq Sadoleti, *Epistolas Leonis X, Clementis VII, et Pauli I nomine scriptae*, Rome 1759 Cf also an excellent collection of documents on the Reformation published by the Oxford University Press, 1911, *Documents illustrating the Continental Reformation* by the Rev B J Kidd, hereinafter referred to simply as Kidd. Dr Kidd merely gives extracts, but quotes his authority on each occasion.

CHAPTER III

CALVINISM

Summary 1 Lefèvre d'Étaples and the Meaux group 2 The youth of Calvin. 3 Calvin, the Reformer of Geneva 4 The Puritan State in Geneva 5 Character sketch of Calvin—his doctrine, the sphere of Calvinist activity and influence

I LEFÈVRE D'ÉTAPLES AND THE MEAUX GROUP

BEFORE Luther had brought forward his 'new Gospel', and diverted the movement in Germany for reform of abuses into a revolt that was to break up the religious unity of Europe, there had been in France efforts to promote salutary reforms and a religious revival on the part of zealous men, who had no idea of a break with the past or any severance from the centre of religious authority in western Europe. Some account may here be given of one of the most notable of these movements. Its record will throw some light on religious conditions and tendencies in France in the years before Calvin came to the front with his endeavour to give a new organization and a definite system of doctrine to the dissidents from unity with Rome.

The promoters of this movement for reforms, to be effected with a due regard to the unity of Christendom, were a group of active and zealous men drawn together under the influence of the learned and devout Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (*Faber Stapulensis*) and the patronage of the generous Guillaume Briçonnet, bishop of Lodève in the Hérault and afterwards bishop of Meaux.

Its members, who were before long to be transferred by Briçonnet from Paris to his episcopal seat (whence they derived their name of 'the Meaux group'), were free from the violent rage and radical antipathies which actuated Luther and his disciples. They had, no doubt, certain characteristics in common with the Wittenberg Reformers, that is to say, the same dislike for what they regarded as the fine-spun arguments of the schoolmen, the same insistence on a 'positive' theology founded on the Bible and the fathers, the same professed desire for reform, and too often something of the same nebulous obscurity in doctrine.

Even Lefèvre found it possible to write with regard to the Church words so inadmissible as these in his Latin preface to his *Commentary on the Four Gospels* (Meaux, April 1522). 'Ever since the time of Constantine, when the early Church which had gradually degenerated, completely lost its character . . .', a form of expression, however, which is probably not to be taken as representing his habitual standpoint, for he certainly did not seriously consider the Church of St. Jerome, St Augustine, St Chrysostom, and so many other illustrious doctors of Christianity as hopelessly degenerate.

Jacques Lefèvre was born at Étaples (in Latin *Stapulae*), a small port in Picardy, not far from Boulogne, between the years 1440 and 1450. There is no record of his childhood and education. Guillaume Farel has paid homage to his great piety 'Never have I seen any one sing Mass with greater reverence, although I have been everywhere to seek, even into the remotest Charterhouses and monasteries . . .'¹ On his appointment to a professorship in the College of Cardinal Lemoine in Paris, after an important journey to Italy, he lectured on Aristotle according to the methods he had seen practised by the Italian Humanists. He broke with the past, but he displayed a generous eclecticism in the choice of his authors Raymund Lull, the 'enlightened doctor', Dionysius the Areopagite, St. John Damascene, Nicholas of Cusa, the great mystics of the school of St. Victor and the Rhine. He showed a strange tendency for the occult sciences. But he was in friendly relations with all the devout and zealous reformers in Paris, with Mombaer, the saintly abbot of Livry, with Jean Standonck (the austere rector of the College of Montaigu, whom Erasmus vilified), with Bourgoin and the Benedictine Jean Raulin, the reformers of the Order of Cluny. Josse Clichtowe, a Fleming and one of his most distinguished pupils, became the tutor of the young Briçonnet, whom his family destined for a high career in the Church, and he passed on to him the torch of the reforming movement.

Briçonnet, on becoming abbot of St. Germain-des-Prés,

¹ *Du vray usage de la Croix Epistre à tous seigneurs*, 1560, p. 170.

installed his tutor's venerated master there, and Lefèvre was beholden to his interest for leisure and the means to profit by it. He put both to good use and published, in 1509, a monumental work, the *Psalterium Quincuplex* or *Fivefold Psalter*, which marked an epoch in the university life of the time. It gave a strong impulse to Biblical studies. Protestants are therefore inclined to annex this activity of Lefèvre's to their own history. But he was in no sense detached from the Church. He was remarkable for his fervent devotion to monastic piety. He persuaded Briçonnet to reform St Germain-des-Prés, not to expel the monks. He was zealous also in devotion to Our Lady. He regarded the ancient philosophers as inspired by God to prepare the way for the truth of the Gospel. He would gladly have reconciled the wisdom of antiquity with the truths of the Christian religion. He represented ideals which, although occasionally rash and therefore dangerous, were fundamentally orthodox and certainly Catholic, at least in intention.

Briçonnet had been appointed to Meaux in 1516, but was absent for two years on a diplomatic mission and did not take effective possession of his diocese until 1518. His first step was to send for Lefèvre and shortly afterwards to appoint him vicar-general. Together they undertook the task of preaching reform throughout the diocese. To this end they gathered round them men of goodwill, bred (at any rate as they thought) in the new methods of intimate and personal contact with Holy Scripture. Their associates were, however, a rather mixed and varied group; excellent, fervent Catholics like Josse Clichtowe and Martial Mazurier, vague mystics after the fashion of Briçonnet himself, like Gerard Roussel and Michel d'Arande, mere adventurers like Pierre Caroli, and violent, undisciplined characters like Guillaume Farel.

The new preachers whose assistance Briçonnet and Lefèvre had enlisted provoked a storm of protests, and it would, indeed, appear that their conduct, no less than their language, left a great deal to be desired and was open to criticism. The Sorbonne, which had kept an eye on the whole movement, accused Lefèvre of heresy. Lutheranism at the time was beginning to

filter into France and encountering the fiercest opposition from the Catholics. The battle against the innovations was led with violent energy and some narrow-mindedness by Noel Béda or Bédier, the Syndic of the Sorbonne, who was firmly convinced of the dangers to which the passion for novelty would expose the Church and as firmly resolved to resist it even at the risk of his liberty and life. The court was divided between the two parties and hesitated. Francis I warmly welcomed everything that was modern, but he fully realized the extent to which religious divisions could weaken a State. He was therefore determined to encourage such divisions to the utmost of his power in the States of his rival Charles V and to avoid them at all costs in his own realm. Margaret of Angoulême, the king's sister, on the other hand, took the Meaux group openly under her patronage. She carried on a voluminous correspondence with Briçonnet and was becoming imbued with the vague mysticism which the worthy bishop took for the pure teaching of Christ. Gerard Roussel and Michel d'Arande had become her favourite preachers.

Despite the criticisms of the Sorbonne, Briçonnet and Lefèvre, fortified with the encouragement and approbation of the court, continued their campaign. In 1523 Lefèvre published the New Testament and the Psalter in the vernacular so that the knowledge of them might be diffused among the people. He was convinced that it would be enough to place souls in contact with the Gospel to bring them in crowds to the practice of piety.

Nevertheless, to make it quite clear that he had no intention of breaking with the Church or following the methods so noisily proclaimed by the unorthodox, Briçonnet, with the full concurrence of his vicar-general, issued at the same time, the 15th October 1523, a synodal decree forbidding under penalty of excommunication 'the purchase, borrowing, reading, possession or carrying about of the books of Martin Luther and other books said to be inspired by his teaching and written under assumed names. . . .' A second edict, dated the 13th December, decreed anathema against any parish priest who dared to allow

a Lutheran preacher to preach in his church or professed a doctrine similar to that taught by Luther

Lefèvre and Briçonnet, therefore, were well aware of the danger to which Luther's intemperate dogmatism exposed their efforts at reform from within. Luther's ideas had, in fact, begun to penetrate among the working-classes of Meaux, 'the artisans, wool-carders, and drapers', in the words of Theodore Beza. In the minds of poor folk, embittered by deplorable economic conditions, such ideas acted like a violent ferment. They were forcibly repressed by the authorities. One Jean le Clerc, a wool-carder, was whipped and branded, first at Paris and then at Meaux. The 'Fabrian' party (Lefèvre's latinized name was *Faber*) was split into pieces by force of circumstances. One section returned to the Church, another went over openly to Lutheranism, the rest continued to seek an impossible middle course.

Lefèvre drank the cup of bitterness to the dregs. Assailed in his public reputation as a Catholic and threatened with legal proceedings by Parliament at the instigation of the Sorbonne, he took fright and, oblivious of the fact that his action would be his own worst condemnation, fled for shelter for the time being to Wolfgang Capito, one of the Strassburg 'Reformers'. All that remained of the Meaux group was the memory of an attempt which had failed.

It would nevertheless appear, as will later be shown, that through Gerard Roussel (who was shortly afterwards appointed, owing to the patronage of Margaret of Angoulême, official preacher at the Louvre) the Meaux group had some connexion with a much more radical movement to which Calvin has given his name.

2 THE YOUTH OF CALVIN (1509-33)

The future leader of French-speaking Protestantism, John Cauvin, latinized as *Calvinus*, 'the bald-head', and then turned back into French again as Calvin, was born at Noyon on the confines of Picardy on the 10th July 1509. He belonged, therefore, to the generation which succeeded Luther and Zwingli and

was twenty-five years younger than they were Gerard Calvin, his father, was procurator-fiscal for the county, secretary to the bishop, an exceedingly able practitioner, and, according to one historian, 'a fiery spirit with a consummate experience in the most subtle algebra of legal proceedings' Master Gerard lost himself so thoroughly in the labyrinth of chicanery that he died excommunicate in 1531, little regretted apparently by his most distinguished son¹ John Calvin's elder brother, Charles, became a priest, brought many troubles on himself on account of his character, and in his turn died excommunicate in 1537.

After some years' study at Noyon, John received the tonsure at the age of nine and with it the grant of a small benefice, the income of which was intended to help to defray the expenses of further schooling He came to Paris in the month of August 1523, with the children of the noble family of Montmor Paris was already claiming to be *la ville-lumière*, the city of light, whose university, though it had somewhat fallen away from the high standard of previous centuries, yet still enjoyed the reputation of being the leading university in the world Paris bestowed learning and renown, so Calvin came to Paris at the age of fifteen, full of high ambition and encouraged by the hopes of his father He took lodgings in the house of his uncle Richard, a locksmith settled near St Germain l'Auxerrois, and first followed as a *martinet* ('a martlet'), that is to say a day-boy, lectures in literature at the Collège de la Marche There he had the good fortune to come into contact with a Regent of the College, Mathurin Cordier, who gave him his first notion of what style should be—the secret of effective writing Calvin was later to express his gratitude to his master in the elegant dedication to him of his *Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Thessalonians*.² 'It is to you that I attribute', he writes, 'whatever subsequent progress I have been able to make and I desire to testify to the fact before posterity If posterity derives any profit from my writings, it must know that it is partly beholden for it to you.'

¹ Cf. Calvin's letter of the 14th May 1531 to Nic. Duchemin in Herminjard, *op. cit.*, II, at p. 338

² *Op. Calvin*, ep. 1345, XIII, at p. 525.

Calvin soon left the Collège de la Marche for the Collège de Montaigu, where he seems to have remained for three years, from 1524 to 1527. There he found reminders of Erasmus, who about the same time was recalling in his *Colloquia* his sojourn at Montaigu and complaining of the régime to which he had been subjected. A Spanish student was to make his appearance in the same institution a little later, undismayed at the prospect of having to associate at his age with boys, an ex-courtier and distinguished soldier whose name was Ignatius Loyola.

The chief exercise in the college course was disputation. 'They debate before dinner,' wrote Ludovico Vives, the famous humanist, 'they debate during dinner, they debate after dinner, they debate in public and in private, everywhere, and at all times.'

This perpetual mental gymnastic degenerated, no doubt, not infrequently into a kind of intellectual acrobatism. The disputants would be anxious not so much to be right as to have the last word. The son of the notary and procurator-fiscal of Noyon distinguished himself in these daily bouts by the marvellous display of an acute and subtle intelligence and a harsh and obstinate temper. At Montaigu he acquired the art of 'driving home an argument', a form of skill on which he later prided himself. Beza relates that he was not slow in 'severely censuring' his companions, a characteristic to which he no doubt owed his sobriquet of 'the Accusative'. And yet he had his friends, although his attachments seem to have been tempered from the beginning with a feeling among those who shared them of respect and awe for the model scholar who seemed to be mature beyond his years and later described his own character in the significant words: 'Being naturally rather timid and bashful, I have always liked repose and tranquillity'¹.

Confidences of such a kind from the pen of Calvin are rare indeed. He has left us no *Table-Talk* like Luther's to serve as material wherewith to construct a legend of his past for history to make its own. And we know nothing of the impression (if any) made on his mind by the theological discussions and

¹ *Op. Calvini*, xxxi. 23

troubles of the time. The school which Briçonnet and Lefèvre had formed had broken up. The first executions of Lutherans had just taken place. One Jean Vallières had been burned on the 8th August 1523. A compatriot of Calvin's, a certain Jacques Pavant or Pavanes or Pauvan (the name is variously spelt), a Picard and one of the Meaux preachers, had been thrown into prison in 1524. He had retracted his errors at Christmas of the same year, then, for relapsing into heresy, had been burned on the Place de Grève in the course of 1525. Louis de Berquin, another Picard gentleman and an ardent admirer of Erasmus, who found the fervour of his devotion occasionally embarrassing,¹ also fell into disfavour with the Sorbonne which, since its solemn condemnation on the 15th April 1521 of a hundred and three of Luther's propositions scented Lutheranism everywhere and eagerly denounced to the courts all whom it even suspected of plotting to destroy the religious unity of the nation. Berquin was arrested in 1523, liberated through the intervention of Louisa of Savoy, re-imprisoned and condemned to death in 1526, freed once again on the king's express order after his return from captivity at Madrid (17th March), imprisoned a third time and again condemned to death. He was finally burned on the 17th April 1529.

Incidents of the sort could not fail to arouse keen interest in the minds of men in a college where discussion was carried on night and day. The resounding quarrels between the Innovators and the Sorbonnists, between Luther and Zwingli, must have formed the subject of many a debate among the apprentice theologians of the Collège de Montaigu. The rector of the college at that time happened to be the Noel Bédier before mentioned as one of the most formidable opponents of Lutheranism in France. Calvin would seem to have sided with authority. At all events he has never referred in his writings to any feeling of disapproval he may have felt at the severities meted out to the heretics. Such a form of retribution, to judge from his own later attitude towards dissenters at Geneva, must have seemed to him well justified.

¹ Heiminjard, 1. 156, 173, II 196 et seq.

He had left Paris early in 1528 to go and study law first at Orleans and then at Bourges. His father had destined him at first for the ecclesiastical state, but had now come to the conclusion that the law was a surer road to riches and repute than the Church. Before leaving the capital, he had formed an association with his cousin Pierre Robert Olivetan, a native, like himself, of Noyon, who had been completely won over to Protestant ideas. The influence of Melchior Wolmar, a Lutheran professor at Bourges, contributed no doubt to speed him in the same direction. Between 1529 and 1531, his father's quarrels with the Chapter of Noyon, and the excommunication which may have been the consequence thereof, appear to have separated the son from the Church. After his father's death Calvin devoted himself to classical studies and published, in 1532, a Commentary on the *De Clementia* of Seneca. A dozen of his letters written about this time are still extant. They disclose no particular animus against Catholicism. He related later that what had long held him back was a feeling of 'reverence for the Church'¹ and his dislike of the violent quarrels between Zwingli and Luther with reference to the Blessed Sacrament. The Catholics had already begun to use against the Protestants the conclusive argument of 'variations', which Bossuet was to develop with such masterly skill in the following century. On the 25th April 1530 Bucer wrote to Luther 'We have recently received some letters from our brethren in France. They say that the Gospel is gradually spreading over there, but that our unfortunate dispute (the sacramental controversy) is such an obstacle in the way that, if it is not settled, they have no hope of France ever accepting our teaching officially.'²

It was precisely such a feeling which for a number of years kept Calvin, on his own admission, from going over to Protestantism.

It should be observed that he had nothing in common with Luther. Luther was impulsive, a restless, violent character,

¹ Cf the famous reply to the no less famous letter addressed on the 18th March 1539 to the citizens of Geneva by Jacopo Sadoleto, bishop of Carpentras, in *Op. Calvin*, v. 412-13.

² Herminjard, op. cit., vol. II, letter no. 305, p. 271.

desperately striving to discover some solution for his doubts, his fears, his fits of remorse, and finding it in a mystical doctrine expressly invented to satisfy the bent of his own feelings. Calvin was emotional, but his emotion was, so to speak, cold and calculated, an enthusiasm for ideas and theories derived from books. He was to prove as captious and cavilling in theology as his father before him had been in law.

Early in 1533 he was again in Paris. He had come to follow the lectures at the Collège de France, which had just been founded by Francis I, and there he became acquainted with a group of Reformers strongly tainted with Lutheranism. He was attracted by the doctrine of Luther, which taught him to turn his eyes into his own heart, there to experience the terror of all-pervading sin and predestined doom and to throw himself into 'faith' alone in Christ in order to find 'consolation'.

This morbid longing for *mystical consolation* was, as has been said, the romanticism of the century, a disease of the age. It was also the essence of Lutheranism, and Calvin took a strange delight in it. One of the most admired books in the Protestant circles frequented by Calvin in that year 1533, the decisive year for him, was a translation from Luther by Louis de Berquin entitled *The Consolation of a Christian soul against the Afflictions of this World and Scruples of Conscience*.¹ It is not, therefore, surprising to learn from Calvin's *Reply to Sadoleto* in 1539 that it was in order to find such 'consolation' as his heart craved that he had become converted to Lutheranism. He tells us, moreover, that the change was due to 'a sudden conversion'.² It may reasonably be conjectured that he was one of those who flocked to hear the sermons of Gerard Roussel, who had all Paris for an audience in the Lent of that year 1533. Roussel, however, was loath to break with the Church. Calvin might perhaps have adopted the same attitude but for an incident which forced him to declare himself.

His old fellow pupil at the Collège de Montaigu, Nicholas Cop, a son of the king's physician and himself a medical

¹ *The Tessaradecas Consolatoria*, ap. *Op. Lutheri*, Weimar, vi 104-34.

² Cf the Preface to his *Commentary on the Psalms*, 1557.

student, had been appointed rector of the university of Paris for a term of three months. As such it was his duty to deliver an inaugural address at the opening of the session on the 1st November 1533. He asked his friend Calvin, whose theological erudition dazzled him, to write his discourse for him. Calvin agreed and composed a sermon brimful of Lutheran theories about justification by faith alone and enlivened with brisk sallies against 'the Pharisees' and 'the Sophists'. The influence of Roussel was traceable from the fact that the exordium concluded, according to the custom of the Meaux preachers, with the traditional invocation to Our Lady, *Ave gratia plena*

Great was the indignation among the masters of the Sorbonne at hearing a mere medical student like young Cop reading a disquisition on theology replete with the most dangerous ideas. Cop was forthwith denounced to Parliament, proceedings for heresy were instituted against him and he fled to Basel. His friend Calvin likewise disappeared in May 1534 he went to Noyon and thence to Saintonge to lodge with a friend, Canon du Tillet, whom he had converted to the new ideas but who returned a little later to the Church of his earlier years.

Then it would appear that the last links were snapped which bound Calvin to the French moderate reforming party. They were anxious not to destroy but to purify the Church. They fully realized that the only reformation possible is reformation from within. Calvin, on the contrary, had ceased to believe that the Church of Rome was the Church of Christ. He broke with her like Luther and Zwingli. He left the Church to establish something else which was no longer the Church. It matters little whether such was his design or not. Lefèvre and Roussel had devoted themselves, with many illusions, it may be, but certainly with ardent zeal and abundant conviction to a labour of love. Calvin's achievement, on the other hand, as far as Rome was concerned, was inspired by hatred.

3. CALVIN, THE REFORMER OF GENEVA

Calvin resigned his ecclesiastical benefices on the 4th May 1534—he had been named curé of Pont-l'Évêque since 1529,

although only a tonsured cleric¹—and determined to leave France in the company of his friend, Louis du Tillet, towards the end of that same year. His departure was expedited by the scandal of the ‘Placards’ which occurred during the night of the 17th–18th October. The Protestants of Paris, distracted and excited by the incidents just narrated, had accepted, if indeed they had not ordered,² broadsheets from Antoine Marcourt a minister of Neufchâtel in Switzerland, attacking ‘the disgusting, excessive, and intolerable abuses of the Papal Mass’, and had placarded them in Paris, Rouen, Orleans, Tours, Blois, and even on the doors of the king’s bedchamber in the château of Amboise, where Francis was at the time residing. Excitement rose to fever-pitch throughout the country. The king was furious, and ordered the ‘accursed heretic Lutheran sect’ to be suppressed without mercy. Numerous executions followed. A solemn procession of reparation was decreed (21st January 1535). Protestantism lost whatever chance it had of establishing itself in Paris during his reign, while it required the intervention of Pope Paul III to put an end to the executions in the capital.³

On leaving his country, Calvin betook himself first to Strasburg and afterwards to Basel (beginning of 1535). There he completed the first (Latin) edition of his *Christianae religionis Institutio*.⁴ It appeared with a prefatory letter to Francis I dated the 23rd August 1535. The work was not published until March 1536. Calvin immediately afterwards left for Italy, where he was received with favour by Renée, duchess of Ferrara, a daughter of Louis XII, who was in active sympathy with the

¹ In such cases, by an abuse of the time, the holder of the benefice used some small part of the income from it to pay a priest to fulfil its duties.

² M Arthur Piaget has recently proved that Picrè Viret had a hand in the affair of the placards and has cast considerable doubt on Crespin’s account of their diffusion. The author’s opinion is that there is no necessary discrepancy between that account and the events which M Piaget has brought to light. Cf *Les Actes de la Dispute de Lausanne*, Neufchâtel, 1927, Pref., p xix.

³ Herminjard, no 515, iii, p 153 Letter of the 9th July 1535.

⁴ The author considers as conclusive the contention of M Pannier and other scholars, that the first French edition of the *Institutio* was printed at Geneva as early as 1537 and was on sale in March of that year, not in 1541 only. Cf *Revue d’histoire et de philosophie religieuse*, Nov.–Dec. 1928, Strasburg, pp. 513–34.

Reformers On his way back during the month of August 1536, as he was passing through Geneva to return to Strasburg, he was detained in Geneva by the urgent entreaties of Guillaume Farel Farel, whom we have seen among the disciples of Lefèvre at Meaux, was a native of Gap, in the Dauphine On leaving Meaux he had taken his restless mind and intemperate zeal to Basel (1523). Erasmus had succeeded in having him expelled from the city as a dangerous agitator and dubbed him with an opprobrious epithet Early in 1527 Farel, under the high patronage of the Council of Berne, had adopted the career of an itinerant Protestant evangelist, preaching his doctrine from city to city. He had been declaiming in Geneva since 1532 with the support of Viret and Antoine Froment, and as the city was engaged in bitter conflict with its bishop and the duke of Savoy, had been successful in securing the official adoption of Protestant doctrine Mass was abolished on the 10th August 1535, monasteries were suppressed and the monks expelled, while the destinies of Geneva were entrusted to Berne. On the 8th February 1534 its citizens had pronounced for union with Switzerland on the 21st May 1536 they swore fidelity to the Reform The reign of the bishop and the house of Savoy was over.

Farel realized that in annexing to his Church, almost by force, a young man as talented as Calvin (he was only twenty-six), he was assuring the future of his organization French-speaking Protestantism had not as yet acquired any very definite system of doctrine. The author of the *Christianae religionis Institutio* had at once established himself as a master in his party The *Institutio* was translated in the following year into French It was to increase in bulk from year to year¹ until it came to be a complete statement of the programme of the Protestant party, one of the books which have exercised a great influence in history. Although Calvin followed Luther on most points, he is not, as is sometimes said, a mere imitator or successor. His genius as a writer breathed fresh life into his subject. Lutheran

¹ Six chapters in the first edition four books and eighty chapters in the last edition (1559).

theology acquired in his hands a rigidity and precision which the unsystematic mind of Luther could never have imposed on it. Certain distinctively Lutheran doctrines, such as that of predestination or the certitude of salvation, were given such prominence in Calvin's work that he has been erroneously considered as the inventor of them. But Calvin showed his originality in his political ideas also, and for that reason his activity in Geneva deserves close and careful consideration.

Luther, as has been said, practically abdicated into the hands of his prince and remitted to the State the religious authority which he had denied to the Pope and the bishops. He thus founded *State Churches*. Calvin adopted a different position. Far from absorbing the Church into the State, he would rather have absorbed the State into the Church. Indeed, far from the Lutheran and Calvinistic positions being the same, the Catholic position, which insists on both a spiritual and a temporal obedience, is rather a mean between the two Protestant extremes. Calvin presented himself to the Council of Geneva from the very beginning as the representative of God, the interpreter of the Bible, the inspired prophet whose orders were to be obeyed without question.

The citizens of Geneva did not submit without resistance to this new kind of theocracy. Calvin taxed all his opponents with 'libertinage' but the 'libertines' prevailed at the elections of 1538. On the 11th March the Council of the Two Hundred requested the preachers (Farel and Calvin) not 'to meddle in politics'. The conflict broke out on a matter of trifling importance. Calvin would have had the Last Supper commemorated with ordinary bread. the magistrates, clinging to the custom of Berne, insisted that the bread should be *unleavened*. Calvin was not the man to give way, even in such a small thing. On the 23rd April 1538 he left the city, accompanied by Farel. Farel retired to Neuschâtel, where, with the exception of a bold but fruitless attempt on Metz in 1542-3, he was to remain until he died on the 13th December 1565. Calvin, on the other hand, accepted an invitation from Bucer and betook himself to Strasburg, where on the 8th September

he was appointed pastor to the French refugees and afterwards professor of theology, with a salary paid by the town. There also he published a number of important works, notably the *Reply to Sadolet* before referred to. Meanwhile, the Genevese had begun to regret his departure from their city. The lofty style of his *Reply to Sadolet* compelled admiration and the Council gave orders for it to be printed. The Guillermains—the partisans of Guillaume Farel—gained the upper hand. The elections in February 1540 were in their favour, and on the 5th June Calvin's principal opponents were condemned to death. Embassy after embassy was sent to Calvin imploring him to return. He held out for a long time, dictated his conditions, and finally returned to the city in triumph on the 13th September 1541.

His reign was to last without interruption until his death on the 27th May 1564. During his exile in Strasburg he had married the widow of an Anabaptist, a certain Idelette de Bure. By her first marriage she had a daughter who brought many troubles on the Reformer by the scandals she caused. His wife bore Calvin a son, who died in childhood.

From 1541 onwards Calvin was master of Geneva. He ruled the city like a Pope. And yet his only title was that of 'servant of Geneva', but the servant was lodged by the city in a plainly furnished house with a beautiful garden, in the Rue des Chanoines, and received a salary of 500 florins, twice as much as any other preacher. He did not become a citizen of Geneva until 1559.

Despite the lowness of his title, Calvin considered himself for all his unworthiness as another Moses. He had the same kind of self-confidence as that of Luther. He took his stand on the Bible as if it were his private property, his sacrosanct domain. He assumed to himself the infallibility he denied to the Catholic Church. He professed humility, but in the conventional spirit that was to be expected. In May 1553 he wrote to M. d'Aubeterre as follows. 'I confess it would be excessive presumption on my part to trust to my own understanding in the belief that I possessed better judgement than other men', but

he went on to say, almost in the next line: 'Inasmuch as God has given me the grace of instructing me in the difference between good and evil, I must conform to such a ruling.'

Nothing could stop a prophet who enjoyed such self-assurance: no hesitations affected him. He spoke as the oracle of God. He issued orders, uttered threats, delivered his teaching, imposed his ideas, his manner of seeing, his will—all in the name of a book, no secret in which was unrevealed to him, every intention of which he could convey. By the example he set and the lessons he imparted, he created a new type of man upon the earth, the *Puritan*, the Bible-man, and a new political régime which M. Choisy has very aptly termed *Bibliocracy*.¹

4. THE PURITAN STATE IN GENEVA

Puritanism was one day to select New England as the chosen land. But its birthplace was Geneva and it was the work of Calvin. Therein lies the difference between Calvinism and Lutheranism. Luther had preached justification by faith without good works and had never been willing or able to say how far good works were connected with salvation. He certainly declared that they were produced by faith, as a good tree bears good fruit. But his language on the point was so shifty, so uncertain, so deliberately obscure, that moral indifferentism spread throughout the Lutheran churches in a way that none could fail to perceive.

Calvin determined to react against such unpleasant consequences of the doctrine. He maintained that good works are not merits, that God does not place them to our credit, that He justifies mankind out of pure grace by means of faith. But he insisted upon the necessity of good works, and so strongly that people might well have wondered if he might not on this point revert to Catholic doctrine pure and simple. In his *Catechism* of 1553, for example, to the question: 'But can we believe in order to be justified without performing good works?' he answers: 'It is impossible. For belief in Jesus Christ means receiving Him as He offers Himself to us. Now He promises us not only to deliver

¹ Cf. his *La Théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin*, Geneva, 1897.

us from death and restore us in the grace of God the Father through the merits of His innocence, but also to regenerate us by His spirit so as to make us live holy lives.'

Calvin conceived the State as destined to apply the divine law by means of its municipal laws and its police. The State must therefore obey the ministers of the Gospel. The distinction between the spiritual and the temporal power, clearly taught in the Gospel, was practically abolished by Calvin. There was a reversion to the Old Testament theocracy. All the Calvinist, that is to say, the Puritan State, knew was the law of fear. It ignored or forgot the law of love. Never was the yoke of religion more oppressive, never more galling. This enforced austerity was such as was bound to be followed by a fearful reaction, as in England the violent constraints of the Puritan régime were followed by the dissolution of morals under the Restoration.

The constitution which Calvin's *Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques* set up in Geneva in 1541 was a marvel of precision in vigilance and discipline. At the apex of authority were the *ministers* whose duty it was to proclaim the Word of God, to administer the Sacraments—and fraternal correction. Below them came the *doctors* who taught in the public schools, then the deacons, whose function was to distribute alms.

Above all these different orders, however, soared the *Consistory*—a body composed of six presiding ministers and twelve *elders*, appointed by the smaller Council after consultation with the ministers and the Great Council of Two Hundred. The elders ranked below the doctors in the hierarchy but above the deacons: as a corporation, however, with their presidents, they controlled and directed everything. The Consistory was the centre of the ecclesiastical government in the Calvinist State. The State was necessarily represented so that offenders might be summoned before that body to receive such admonishment as their misconduct deserved. It was a judicial body and sat every Thursday to 'consider carefully every citizen's manner of life and to admonish kindly any one who had been observed to stray from the narrow path of his strict duty and to be leading

a disorderly life'. It had universal jurisdiction it made inquiries, issued reprimands, denounced, when the occasion arose, to the City Council all whom it deemed deserving of punishment. The historian Cramer has extracted from the registers of the Geneva Consistory numerous instances of its activity.¹ Nothing can be more interesting or instructive. People appeared before it for the most innocent frolics as for the wildest debauchery, for having spoken blasphemy or dined too well, for having failed to attend a sermon or muttered a papistical invocation. The Consistory had informers in its pay. Its members were chosen as far as possible from all quarters of the city so as to be able themselves to keep a close and watchful eye on the behaviour of every citizen. They picked up all the gossip of the street and there acquired the knowledge of what 'crimes' they would be called on to suppress. The Consistory had a copy of the *Golden Legend* removed from one citizen's house, compelled a woman to burn under her husband's eyes a *Book of Hours* she had preserved at home, was gravely disturbed to learn that another woman had uttered the 'accursed words' of the *Hail Mary* on her death-bed, rebuked a widow for daring to breathe over her husband's grave the prayer, *God rest his soul in peace*, and threw into prison some peasants guilty of having kept a fast—these were mere crumbs of the Consistory's weekly activity.

It was the instrument Calvin used to uphold his authority in Geneva. This end was not achieved without a struggle. The Reformer consolidated his work between 1542 and 1548. He took a personal part in the sittings of the Consistory. He considered that the city where, as everywhere else, considerable licence of morals prevailed, needed to be taken in hand. He raged with pitiless severity. There was not a moment's respite from his inquisition. On the 20th December 1543 Clement Marot, the poet, famous for his translation of the Psalms into French verse, was cited before the Consistory. His crime was that of having played a game of backgammon with a Calvinist zealot of the name of Bonivard, the two drinking, as they played,

¹ Cf. Cramer, *Notes extraites des registres du Consistoire de Genève*, pp 8, 15, 36, 48, 84, 89 et passim.

a pint of wine. It was a serious offence Marot was requested to leave the city¹

The very excess of such severity provoked resistance. Calvin spared nobody. He had the courage to attack the most influential and important families Pierre Ameaux, a manufacturer of playing cards, far from well disposed to a political régime which involved him in a loss of customers, dared to abuse the Reformer He was thrown into prison and condemned to make an apology in solemn form, standing bare-headed in his shirt with a lighted candle in his hand—and yet Pierre Ameaux was a member of the Council Ami Perrin, captain-general of the city, the son-in-law of François Favre whose descendants still live in Geneva, was a citizen of even greater consequence. The members of the Favre family were all strong, independent characters. They enjoyed life, they lived well, there was merriment in their household These worthy citizens gave a ball to celebrate a wedding. The Consistory held an investigation and summoned the ladies and gentlemen who had danced to appear before them. Ami Perrin had made no concealment of the 'crime' which had been committed Calvin thundered against dancing and swore that he would bring the guilty parties to their senses. The quarrel long agitated the town. Perrin, likewise, was compelled to ask for pardon. His wife committed a second offence she expiated it in prison. Jacques Gruet, a friend of the family, was beheaded on account of incriminating scraps of paper discovered in his house in the course of a raid

Perrin, however, had his revenge in 1548. His partisans triumphed at the elections and he was appointed Syndic A strong reaction sprang up against the French Calvin had welcomed to his house and to the city the refugees who fled from Henry II's persecution of Protestantism He looked upon such fugitives as confessors of the faith and relied on their help to achieve the 'regeneration' of Geneva The citizens of the old families grew indignant at the influence foreigners had begun to exercise within their walls. Calvin then passed through a difficult period. He recalled on his death-bed the time when

¹ Cf. Cramer, op cit, pp 15-16

he could not cross the street without seeing people set dogs on him and having his clothes or legs snapped at. The year 1553 was decisive. The Perrin party had won a complete victory in the February elections. The irritation against foreigners was extreme. ‘Anger and bitterness against me rose to such a pitch’, said Calvin, ‘that whatever I said aroused suspicion. Even if I said that it was sunny at noonday, people immediately began to doubt it.’

His authority was suddenly re-established in this critical time by a sombre incident destined to be a lasting blot on the memory of the ‘Reformer’—the execution of the Spanish doctor, Michael Servetus.¹ Servetus also had a passion for asserting his opinions as dogmatic certainties. He held that there was no mention in the Bible of the Trinity and accordingly rejected this traditional Christian doctrine. His *De Trinitatis Erroribus* was published in 1551, and the following year saw two dialogues on the same theme he had to flee from France. Early in 1553 he set forth his point of view in another book, *Christianismi Restitutio*, with an appendix of controversial letters with Calvin. The Reformer promptly denounced him to the Inquisition at Vienne, and Servetus was condemned to the stake. He escaped, apparently with the complicity of his gaolers, but rashly passed through Geneva on his way to Naples. He was recognized, apprehended, and tried. He defended himself with energy, but was condemned to the stake and duly burned on the 27th October 1553. Calvin published in the following February a *Defence against Servetus*, in which he again publicly approved the execution of his adversary, but contemptuously, albeit falsely, denied any complicity in the earlier denunciation of Servetus to the Catholic Inquisition.²

The very attempt of the Perrin party to save the hapless man was accounted against them. Calvin was universally applauded

¹ Miguel Serveto y Reve was his family name. He was born at Tudela, in Navarre, about 1511, of Aragonese parents, studied at Toulouse, and attended Juan de Quintana, the confessor of Charles V, at Bologna (1529) and Augsburg. He studied medicine in Paris with great distinction, and it is even claimed for him that he was the first discoverer of the circulation of the blood.

² Ori, the Inquisitor, was able to produce the letter of denunciation from Calvin

for standing forth as a defender of the faith. The Perrin party were defeated at the elections of 1554, and Calvin had a host of French refugees received among the citizens. The following year he gained a decisive victory in the struggle he had been waging for twelve years past to secure the formidable power of excommunication. Calvin would have had it reserved exclusively to the Consistory the Council insisted upon keeping the terrible weapon in their own hands. Calvin had already declared in 1543 that he would rather die or go into exile than surrender such a right. The Council in the end gave way. The Church thereby dominated the State. Ministers, to be sure, were appointed by the civil power, but once appointed they controlled the very power from which they had received their appointments with all the authority conferred by the privileged dispensation of divine truth.¹

Calvin ruled the city of Geneva from 1554 until his death on the 27th May 1564. He encountered no adversary who gave him any cause for alarm. Only after his death did difficulties arise and the city make another attempt to shake off the iron yoke he had had the skill to impose.

5. CHARACTER-SKETCH OF CALVIN, HIS DOCTRINE, THE SPHERE OF CALVINIST ACTIVITY AND INFLUENCE

The moral portrait of Calvin may be gathered from the preceding narrative. His own impression of himself was that he had ever been 'bashful'. The impression he gave his acquaintances was altogether different. His actions show a marvellous tenacity, his words an assurance, a confidence in his doctrine verging on illuminism. He delivered his own panegyric on his death-bed: 'As for my doctrine,' were his dying words, 'I have taught it faithfully and God granted me the grace to write it down. I have done so as faithfully as I knew how and have not altered a single passage in Scripture or consciously distorted it.' All his life long he had that conviction of being the interpreter, the prophet of God. It was the source of his influence over his contemporaries. He ruled by the terror of divine judgement. He posed

¹ Cf the note to page 123.

as if he were in possession of the awful secret of predestination. If men believed in his teaching they were saved. if they rejected it, they were damned He was God's chosen instrument to summon a number of men to Heaven and to cast the rest into Hell He spoke boldly, 'roundly' he was fond of saying, ceaselessly reminded men that God wanted to ride them 'on the curb', otherwise mankind would only be 'wild beasts'. He preached 'the doctrine', that is to say, the true science of salvation It all came back to this. His style, which is sometimes familiar and lively, relieved with proverbial sayings, with highly coloured similes and unexpected comparisons, but marred by unsparing abuse of his opponents, is, as a rule, tense, concise, and vigorous, penetrated with the will to convince and vivified by the parade of a dogmatic certitude which seems to despise and repel objections even before they have been formulated No man ever wrote in such a tone, with more arrogant and unbending self-assurance The style is entirely Calvin's own. Not even Luther claimed such uncompromising, clear and overwhelming, doctrinal authority¹

His style so powerfully affects the reader that Calvin is often paid the honour, which he certainly does not deserve, of being regarded as irresistibly logical His panegyrists do not realize that he affirms ever so much more than he proves The truth is that Calvin, like Luther, is more of a mystic than a logician. He does not argue, he decides. he does not demonstrate, he proclaims He is not a philosopher, but an oracle. One of his most ardent admirers, the Protestant minister and professor E Doumergue, has written of him as follows 'The most logical of logicians ends in the bankruptcy of logic. His system ends by

¹ Mr Belloc has summed the man's achievement up in a few lapidary lines 'He it was who said that the ministry must proceed from election, but that ministers once elected had authority over the electors . . . He it was who in a fashion not general, like that of the old humanist scholars, but direct and dogmatic, pitted document, however fragmentary, against the living voice of tradition. He it was who rendered humility futile and the appetite for wealth a virtue He it was who began the war against Joy He it was who set up in so definite a fashion the wall which separates the Catholic mind in Europe from its opponents he it was who put up a new positive force directed against the positive force of the Catholic Church ' Cf *How the Reformation happened*, London, 1928, at p 125.

contradicting itself on every point.¹ Nothing could be more true. And M Doumergue's attempts to show that the 'inconsistencies' in his doctrines are merely complementary aspects of 'a metaphysic as rich and variegated as life itself' are ineffectual to refute the charge of absurdity which, philosophically speaking, must be preferred against his harsh and inhuman and, therefore, utterly unevangelical theology.

This is not the place to give a detailed exposition of his theological system, but it may be recalled that it revolves round the theory of predestinarian fatalism.

Calvin defined predestination as 'the eternal counsel of God whereby He has determined His will in respect of every man. *For He did not create them all alike but ordained some to eternal life, the rest to eternal damnation*' Luther, as has been seen, had already professed the same doctrine. But the system assumed in Calvin's hands a sort of terrifying, austere majesty. People at the time could accept, strange as it may appear, the appalling thought of a God who created human beings doomed to the torments of Hell merely to demonstrate His own justice in punishing sins which the sinners were not responsible for committing. Could anything be more illogical than to argue that this was consistent with the infinite goodness of God and human responsibility? Calvin considered it magnificent to conceive of a God who endowed with life creatures capable of thinking and willing and loving, gave them an unquenchable thirst for happiness, and then coldly proceeding to make a selection among them without the least regard to their merits or demerits, with no consideration of the course of their lives, appointed some to Heaven and therefore guaranteed them faith, justification, and certitude of salvation, while the rest were doomed to Hell and so received for their portion vice, gloom of the spirit, and corruption of the heart, simply, it would appear, in order first to be degraded before being damned for ever. Calvin, moreover, considered this execrable doctrine of despair, 'sweet and delicious from the

¹ E Doumergue, *Le Caractère de Calvin*, Paris, 1921, p. 46. M Doumergue is the author of a monumental five-volume biography of his hero, *Jean Calvin, Les hommes et les choses de son temps*, Lausanne, 1899 et seq., which is one long panegyric.

fruit it bears', and repelled all objections, describing them in his harsh, contemptuous way as the 'grunting of pigs'. Jerome Hermes Bolsec, a native of Paris, a physician and an unfrocked Carmelite monk who had turned Protestant, ventured to controvert such an abominable doctrine. He was expelled from Geneva on the 23rd December 1551.

Calvin had the art of making his gloomy theory produce extraordinary results. His disciples admired in him the absolute, joyful, eager submission to the eternal decrees of God, the lordly indifference to the sufferings of the enemies of God, the delirious enthusiasm at the thought of the mercies of God shown to His 'elect'. The arguments of reason counted for nothing among people who had learned from Luther that the only way to honour God is to degrade man, to acknowledge the radical corruption of human nature and the essential perversion of all its faculties.

Modern Calvinists, it is only fair to say, are the first to proclaim the failure of this favourite doctrine of the far-off founder of their Church.

Calvinism, unlike Lutheranism, was not propagated only by the diffusion of printed books containing the doctrine of the master. Geneva became a centre of Protestant culture by the institution in 1559 of a college and an academy. The two together formed a kind of seminary whence ministers and preachers departed in all directions, but chiefly to France, Scotland, and England, to spread the Reformer's doctrine. In a few years 120 ministers were sent to 'churches' in France. These churches had begun to spring up there from 1557 onwards, when those of Orleans and Rouen were founded. Protestant academies were next established on the model of Geneva at Orléans, Saumur, Montauban, Sedan, St. Die, Nîmes, Montpellier, and Orange.¹ The universities and schools of Scotland were reorganized on Presbyterian lines by John Knox² and

¹ Cf Daniel Bourchenin, *Sur les Études Académiques protestantes en France*, Paris, 1882

² Knox returned to Scotland from Geneva on the 2nd May 1559 and was at Perth by the 11th. Before the end of the month, riots had broken out and the Franciscan and Dominican monasteries were sacked by the 'brethren'. The *First Book of Discipline* was published in the following year. 'The results may be studied in

Andrew Melville the university of Heidelberg was made to conform to the pattern

Among Calvin's disciples, besides Knox, were John Laski (à Lasco) and Francisco Lismanini, the future heralds of the Reformation of Poland. Laski had been head of a community of foreign Reformers in London and returned to Poland in 1556. He died in 1560 having effected nothing. Lismanini denied the Trinity and propagated a form of Unitarianism. His activity was short-lived. The Netherlands also were soon to give their adhesion to Calvinism which, by absorbing Zwinglianism, had securely established itself in the greater part of Switzerland.

the records of Kirk Sessions', established on the Genevan model 'A graduated scale of admonitions led up to excommunication, if the subject was refractory, and to boycotting, with civil penalties. The processes had no effect, or none that is visible, in checking lawlessness, robbery, feuds, and manslayings, and after the Reformation, witchcraft increased to monstrous proportions, at least executions of people accused of witchcraft became very numerous, in spite of provision for sermons thrice a week, and for weekly discussions of the Word' Cf Andrew Lang, *John Knox and the Reformation*, London, 1905, at pp 187-8

SOURCES

- Herminjard, A. L., *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française*, 9 vols published, reaching to the year 1544, Geneva, Bâle, and Lyons, 1886-97
- Opera Calvinii* in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, 59 vols published Cf vols xxiv to lxxvii of the collection, Brunswick and Berlin, 1863-90 Vol xxi of the series contains the *Life of Calvin* by Theodore Beza in three editions, dated respectively 1564, 1565, and 1575 There is an annotated edition of this same life, with an interesting preface, by A Franklin, Geneva, 1859 The *Mémoires de l'Institut National de Genève*, the *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire du Protestantisme*, and the reports of kindred societies contain many material documents

CHAPTER IV

THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION

IN other places in this volume there will be found an account of the genesis of the Church of England and also a summary of the most important Acts of Parliament by which the English religious changes of the sixteenth century were brought about. The English Reformation was different in nature from that of the Continent. Both the Lutheran and the Calvinist revolts on the Continent were primarily religious revolts, which were afterwards made use of by politicians for political purposes. In England it was the politicians who preceded, and indeed in a measure created, the Reformer. When Henry VIII succeeded in 1509 to the throne of an England which was but one reign removed from civil war, he succeeded to the government of a nation in which there was indeed plenty of anti-clericalism and plenty of nationalistic anti-papalism, but which was singularly free from heresy. Had there been no complicating political and economic factors, nothing is less likely than that England would have accepted the Reformation.

Of these complicating factors the two which overshadowed all others in importance were the desire among the new families to get hold of, and then to retain, the abbey lands and the desire of the king to obtain a dissolution of his marriage with Katharine of Aragon. It was the second of those factors which caused Henry, having tried and failed to obtain that dissolution from the Pope, finally to repudiate the authority of the Pope. It was the first which created in England a powerful class, determined that that breach should never be healed.

Henry made no change in defined doctrine. All he did was to transfer to himself that authority which had previously been exercised by the Pope, and right up to the end of his reign he was anxious to prove both his impartiality and his lack of sympathy with Lutheranism by dragging to the stake together and on the same hurdle those who denied the royal headship of the Church and those who denied the infallibility of Catholic

doctrine A More, a Fisher, some Carthusians preferred death to the acceptance of the new order. There was one large rising in the north—the Pilgrimage of Grace—but on the whole the people of England, anti-Papal ever since the time of the Hundred Years War which had coincided with the period of Papal residence at Avignon, infected with the new nationalism and with the Renaissance fashion of monarch-worship, dreading above all things the re-outbreak of civil war, which resistance to the government would entail, accepted the changes with surprisingly, indeed with mysteriously, little protest.

Henry's Reformation was not, then, in any sense intended to be a Protestant Reformation. Yet, naturally enough, the disturbances which it caused gave an opportunity to the preachers of the new doctrines, and in the reign of Henry's son, Edward VI, the first attempts were made to impose upon the Church of England a specifically Protestant doctrine. The attempt was begun by Edward's first government—that of the Protector, Somerset—and continued by his second—that of Northumberland

The changes were intensely unpopular, and were resisted by the people as the changes of Henry's reign had never been resisted. In a confidential letter to the Protector Somerset, written on the 7th July 1549, Sir William Paget, his chief secretary, admits that 'the use of the old religion is forbidden by a law and the use of the new is not imprinted in the stomachs of eleven of the twelve parts of the realm'.¹ The resistance could only be suppressed by the introduction of German mercenaries. On the reason for this Burnet, in his *History of the Reformation*, is surprisingly frank. 'The bulk of the people of England', he says, 'was still possessed with the old superstition to such a degree that it was visible they could not be depended on in any matter that related to the alterations that were made or designed to be made, whereas the Germans were full of zeal on the other side.'²

The motive from which the governing class advocated the

¹ Strype, II, Rec. 110.

² Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, II 329

changes of Edward's reign was, then, not religious but economic. Early in the reign the chantries had followed the way of the monasteries. A small part of their income went to the maintenance of King Edward VI's Grammar Schools, which are not the schools which King Edward VI founded, but the schools which he did not destroy.¹ A far larger part went into the pockets of 'deserving noblemen'. The next discovery was that Calvinism was an even cheaper religion than Henry's Anglicanism. It had been profitable to be rid of the Pope and the monks. It would be more profitable still to be rid of the bishops. Thus Hobey writes to the Protector on the 19th January 1540 hoping 'that the King's Majesty will appoint unto the good bishops an honest and competent living, sufficient for their maintenance, taking from them the rest of their worldly possessions and dignities and thereby avoid the vain glory that letteth truly and sincerely to do their duty'. He would have the Protector, having dealt with the bishops, go on to the chapters. 'It would be a good plan', thinks Hobey, 'if all the prebends within England were converted to the like use for the defence of our country and the maintenance of honest, poor gentlemen'.²

For such purposes did the 'honest, poor gentlemen' of Edward's court use the small body of genuine reformers upon whom they could lay their hands. As a result of 'the King's godly proceedings' family after family rose from nothing into plutocratic wealth, as article after article of Church property was discovered, like the plate of the poor minor-canons of St George's, Windsor, to be 'fit for His Majesty's service and tending to superstitious usages'.³ The full accomplishment of the courtiers' purpose was prevented by Edward's death.

Edward VI was succeeded by his sister, Mary. The new queen was welcomed with rapturous loyalty by the people, and the attempts at treason against her were easily defeated. Her religious policy was a double one—to restore the old forms of

¹ Leach's *English Schools at the Reformation*. Tawney's *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. See also J. Ritchie's *Reflections on Scottish Church History*, chap. viii, 'The Educational Myth'.

² Strype, ii. 88.

³ Kennedy, *Studies in Tudor History*, 110.

service and to restore the Papal supremacy. In the first of these there was no difficulty. The second had to be approached more carefully. It had to be made very clear to the governing families that the restoration of the Papal supremacy would not imply an attempt to restore to religious uses the Church property which had been seized during the last two reigns. Both the Pope and the queen were willing to give promises that the new owners should not be disturbed, and the reconciliation of the country with the Holy See was accomplished. It was welcomed by the people, who were weary of the excesses of the last two reigns.

Mary has left behind her an evil name in popular history. The overwhelming majority of the country, including Elizabeth, the heir to the throne, and almost the entire governing class, accepted the reconciliation. Yet there was a small sprinkling of genuine reforming fanatics, who, preferring, as it was reasonable to prefer if they were sincere, the interests of truth, as they saw it, to that of their country, persistently intrigued through the French ambassador, Noailles, with the king of France, their sovereign's enemy, and with the ambassador of Venice, the enemy of Spain. These reformers hated Catholicism and the priests. It was their purpose to rob the Christian faith of every practice or doctrine which implied a special priestly class. Against them Mary turned.

The sixteenth century was a crude and blood-spilling age, and it is neither probable nor proved that the persecutions were at all a large shock to public opinion. Bitterly though they differed from one another upon what constituted a heretic, there were yet very few people in England at that date who did not grant that heretics should in the last resort be burnt. Ridley, Latimer, and Cranmer, all had burnt others when they had the chance. Politically, the burnings were a blunder, though a blunder the importance of which it is easy to exaggerate. Humane people disliked them and there were protests against them, especially from enlightened priests such as Alfonso de Castro, Philip's confessor. But the notion that the sight of these martyrs' sufferings in some way turned England Protestant is entirely baseless.

We must be careful of too easy agreement with tales of Mary's unpopularity. Much that appeared as hatred of her government meant in truth merely that the rich were in a panic lest she be successful. Certainly her popularity was declining during her last years. Still that decline was due, not to her religious persecution but to the misfortunes of her foreign policy, to the economic distress, to the loss of Calais, and to the impression that she was allowing English interests to be subordinated to those of Spain. Froude says that if only Mary had been content to pursue a tolerant policy she could have postponed the Reformation for a hundred years. But, in recommending a policy of mere toleration, he neglects the existence of a strong minority who were determined from the beginning of her reign to take every opportunity that offered of making Mary's policy odious. This party was not, it is true, the party of the Protestant fanatics. It was the party of the *nouveaux riches*, who knew that whatever the promises of Pope or queen, an England reconverted to Catholicism would never suffer the insolence of those who owed their power and wealth to their successful sacrilege.

Mary's second blunder was her entire neglect of the Church's new triumph, of the great revived intellectual vigour of the Counter-Reformation.

Mary's religious policy, so far as it was genuinely unpopular, was unpopular not because it was Catholic but because it was Spanish. Men did not dislike Spaniards for being Catholics so much as they disliked Catholicism for being Spanish. The wiser of the Spaniards fully saw this. Charles V, her uncle, exhorted her to be *une bonne Anglaise*, and the Spanish influence, such as it was, was always against a too vigorous persecution. The marriage arrangement with Philip was only agreed to on conditions so strict that there was no danger that Philip could ever become the master of England and so satisfactory that Elizabeth herself took them for the model for her own arrangements with Anjou.¹ Yet treaties, though they could prevent Philip from becoming an English king, could not prevent Mary from being a Spanish queen. While the Spaniards exhorted her to be

¹ Lingard, v 209.

English, Mary insisted on being Spanish, though even Spanish Mary, unlike her brother's ministers, never called in foreign troops to preserve her government from its English opponents.

In 1558 Mary died and was succeeded by her half-sister, Elizabeth. Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, had been brought up a Protestant. In Mary's reign she had conformed to Catholicism and, when her sincerity was questioned, had protested to Mary with tears in her eyes, 'I pray God that the earth may open and swallow me alive if I be not a true Roman Catholic'¹. Yet there were few at the time, and have been fewer still since, who did not believe that either the one theology or the other sat upon her but lightly, and that whatever decision upon religious policy she might come to would be dictated largely by worldly considerations.

Along every road there were advantages and there were dangers. The exact arguments which led Elizabeth to her decision are matters of conjecture. Suffice it to say that, trusting that, whatever her policy, she would always receive the support of Philip of Spain, so long as the French Mary, queen of Scots, was her rival, she decided to throw in her lot with the Reforming minority. She chose as her minister William Cecil, a member of one of those new families who had founded their wealth on the spoliation of the monasteries.

Cecil's policy was simple in its purpose, however tortuous in its practice. From Elizabeth's accession to Cecil's death it had but a single aim—to decatholicize England. 'Cecil's single principle is detestation of the Catholic faith',² truly wrote the Spanish ambassador to Philip. To decatholicize England meant not merely to break with the Pope—the breach with the Papacy was but a detail, if a very necessary detail—but to expel the Mass from England. For, as long as people demanded the Mass, they would demand the priest. In order that Cecil and his friends might be safe in their stolen lands it was necessary to persuade people that they could get on well enough without priests.

¹ MS. Life of Duchess of Feria, 129.

² De Quadra to the Bishop of Arras, 31st June 1560. MS. Simancas.

In 1559 the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were passed, and Elizabeth's headship of the Church was defined—in terms slightly more guarded than those which Henry VIII had used. Catholic resistance to this policy was only possible if the new Pope, Pius IV, should give a strong lead by an immediate excommunication of Elizabeth. By skilfully hinting to the Pope that Elizabeth was not yet finally decided upon her religious policy, Cecil persuaded Pius to hold his hand.¹ During these fateful first years the Papacy gave no lead to divided Catholic Europe, while those in England, who might otherwise have been Catholics, were allowed almost without protest to fall into the habit of attending the new Church services. Not until 1562 were the Catholics forbidden to do this. The Papacy was outmanœuvred.

The first thirteen years of Elizabeth's reign were the years of an uneasy truce. The problem of most immediate importance during these years was that of the policy to be adopted towards those in England who refused to support the religious settlement. All the bishops but one had declined to take the oath recognizing Elizabeth as head of the Church. The universities had refused, so had the majority of the higher, and some two hundred of the lower, clergy. Many more would have refused, had not the government, unwilling to make too clean a sweep, practised wholesale connivance at the evasion of its own commands. Archbishop Parker was under instructions 'not to push any one to extremities on account of his oath'. There had been as yet no general attempt to impose the oath upon the laity. It was uncertain what proportion among them would refuse it, but so little support had the government's policy received that it was hard put to it to find Protestant gentlemen enough to fill up its benches of magistrates.

Cecil determined to have the whole question settled by the Parliament and Convocation of 1562. A Bill was presented to the Parliament by which the obligation to take the oath was extended to members of the House of Commons, to school-masters, private tutors, and attorneys, to all persons who had

¹ See Meyer, *England und die Katholische Kirche unter Elizabeth*

ever held office in the Church or in any ecclesiastical court during the present or the last three reigns, but also to all who should openly disapprove of the established worship, or should celebrate, or hear others celebrate, any private Mass. A first refusal to take the oath was created an offence punishable by Praemunire. The punishment for a second offence was to be death.¹

There was some opposition. Yet the Bill, it goes without saying, passed through Parliament just as any Bill for whatever purposes always passed through Parliament in Tudor times, provided it had government backing. Yet the debate in the House of Lords produced at least one brave and interesting speech—that from Lord Montague. Lord Montague began by saying that ‘it was known to all men that the Catholics had created no disturbance in the realm’. He then went on to ask, with considerable ironic humour, whether the scriptural authority for the royal supremacy could be so entirely unquestionable, seeing that the claims of the queen were claims not made by any other prince, whether Catholic or Protestant, anywhere else in Europe. Was it not possible that the Catholics who refused the Oath of Supremacy were at least in good faith? He concluded by a surprisingly frank statement of the real issue. He warned the House not to be intimidated by those ‘who looked to wax mighty and of power, by the confiscation, spoil, and ruin of the houses of noble and ancient men’. ‘What man’, he asked, ‘is there so without courage and stomach, or void of all honour, that can consent or agree to receive an opinion or new religion by force and compulsion?’²

Had Elizabeth really intended to enforce her Act by the exaction of the supreme penalty, the results would have been very horrible, far more horrible than anything that happened under Mary. It is only fair to her to say that she had no intention of doing so. To attempt it would have been folly and she quite genuinely did not want to persecute, if by persecution the rack and the gallows are necessarily implied. Her hope was rather that, with such an Act upon the statute-

¹ Lingard, vi. 40, 41.

² Strype, i. 259–73

book, the Catholics would behave themselves through fear the atheists, greedy for their share of the resulting spoliations through hope of its enforcement.

Cecil, on the other hand, was willing to persecute, but ever he, though ready to persecute by fines or vandalism or dragooning, was not yet prepared for 'bloody' persecution. It was essential to keep the Pope quiet and to allow people to get used to the new services, or rather, to get used to doing without the Mass. The time for bloody persecution would come later.

The beginning of the end of this uneasy truce came in 1568 with the escape over the frontier of Mary, queen of Scots. The circumstances of Scotch history which led up to that escape are described in another part of this volume. Its importance in English history was that the presence of Mary on English soil gave a leader and a figure-head to all those who were discontented with the state of things. Plots immediately sprang into existence. The purpose of the first was to marry Mary to the duke of Norfolk, to restore her to the throne in Scotland, to substitute for the Scotch Calvinism a church on the model of the Anglican, and to compel Elizabeth to recognize Mary as her successor. The plot was discovered and Norfolk and its other leaders arrested and thrown into the Tower. The only result of these arrests was to transfer power among the discontented from the moderate to the extremists. The Elizabethan regulations, imperfectly obeyed anywhere, had in the north of England been quite openly disregarded. 'God's glorious Gospel could not take place', complained the bishop of Carlisle. 'The few Protestants that there were durst not be known for fear of a shrewd turn.' Magistrates who would enforce the law could not be found. There were 'wishings and wagers for the alteration of religion and rumours and tales for the Spaniards and the Frenchmen to come in for the Reformation of the same'.¹ In the North there had not been resistance to the settlement only because no very serious attempt had been made to enforce it in any but the main and most accessible places. 'Religion was

¹ Domestic MSS., vol. xxi.

backward', in the language of the government 'There are not', reports Sadler, Elizabeth's secretary, 'in all this country ten gentlemen that do favour and allow of Her Majesty's proceedings in the cause of religion'¹

In such an atmosphere it was easy enough for the two great northern earls, Percy of Northumberland and Neville of Westmorland, to raise an army to fight for the Catholic religion. The rebellion met with some preliminary success, and Durham was captured and Mass once more celebrated in its cathedral. But it was ill organized. Its armies soon faded away and the government was able to re-establish its authority and to take vengeance on its victims in ruthless massacre. 'I guess that it will not be under six or seven hundred at the least that shall be executed of the common sort, besides the prisoners taken in the field',² boasted Sussex, Elizabeth's commander.

The truce was doubly at an end, for at about the same time from the Catholic side came the Bull of the new Pope, St. Pius V, deposing Elizabeth, releasing her subjects from obligation to her and calling on all Catholic sovereigns to join in deposing her. The Catholic sovereigns meant for all practical purposes the king of Spain and the king of France. These two great monarchs, as has been seen in other contexts, were sharply divided from one another by their large ambitions. The purpose of Cecil's foreign policy during these next years was to see to it that those divisions were in no way composed. At the same time at home the first period of Elizabeth's reign—the period of uneasy truce—was succeeded by a second period, a period of open war. From Cecil's side there was now a frank persecution—in 1577 Cuthbert Mayne, the first of the Elizabethan martyrs, was executed at Launceston. On the Catholic side at last, and too late, it was attempted to meet the attack on English Catholicism with a definite policy. Up till now the Catholic cause in England had been left in the casual hands of 'Queen Mary's priests', as the old pre-Elizabethan Catholic priests were called, a race who would inevitably in course of time die out. To prevent this, in 1568 a certain Lancashire priest, William Allen, founded an

¹ Sadler, ii. 55.

² Sharp's *Memorials*, 121.

English seminary at Douai for the training of priests for the English mission field. It was this recruitment of the Douai college, and of another college which was founded at Rome in 1579, which taught Cecil that Catholicism would not naturally die out in England. It must be eradicated.

Allen first gave to Catholicism a policy of resistance, an organized and thought-out resistance begins with St Pius's Bull and the appearance in England of the first seminary priests about 1570. The period of resistance may be divided again into two: a period of non-political resistance which lasts until experience, and in particular the death of Campion in 1581, shows it to be ridiculous, and a period of political resistance. The first policy both of the seminary priests and of the Jesuits, who in 1580 associated themselves with this work, was frankly to recognize that England had ceased to be a Catholic country in the official sense of the phrase, to ask for only that part of a Catholic life which was of absolutely Divine command: the Sacraments—and to refrain from all politics. They came to England with express instructions from the General to confine themselves to Apostolic work and to the administration of the Sacraments. *Rebus sic stantibus*, the Pope's Bull of deposition was suspended. It was only after Campion's death that his friend, Persons, saw that loyalty and abstention from politics would avail a Catholic priest nothing and became convinced that in foreign invasion lay the only hope of saving the Mass for England.

In 1587 came the execution of Mary, queen of Scots, the Catholic heir to the throne, on the charge of complicity in the Babington plot for the murder of Elizabeth. That Mary was involved in the plot, in so far as it was a plot for her own liberation, she did not deny. That she had ever consented to any plot for the murder of Elizabeth she did deny. It is not possible to pass judgement in a sentence on the extraordinarily complicated tale, but it is safe to say that, at least, she certainly was not proved to be guilty. Her true offences were that she was a Catholic, that she was the heir to the throne, and that she had a greater natural expectation of life than Elizabeth. It did

not suit the purposes of the masters of Elizabethan policy that Mary Stuart should ever be queen of England, and as a couplet from the *Yorkshire Tragedy*, a play of the time, put it

The surest way to chain a woman's tongue
Is break her neck, a politician did it¹

Mary's execution left as the next Catholic claimant to the English throne Philip II of Spain. There was a tradition of friendship between England and Spain which had survived Elizabeth's abandonment of Catholicism, and during the early years of her reign Elizabeth had owed not a little of her security to Spanish support. However, under the influence of the English support of Dutch Protestant rebels, of Spanish support of Irish Catholic rebels, of atrocity and counter-atrocity on the American seas, the two powers had been for some years drifting apart. It is perhaps improbable that peace would in any event have long survived the execution of Mary Stuart, and, as it was, war was precipitated in the next year by Sir Francis Drake's bold attack on the Spanish fleet in the harbour of Cadiz.

¹ *A Yorkshire Tragedy* (1608), Sc v

CHAPTER V

THE CAUSES OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION

Summary 1 Two conflicting theories 2 The causes of the Protestant Revolution
3 Recapitulatory exposition of the causes of the Protestant Revolution

I TWO CONFLICTING THEORIES

HISTORIANS, it may be said, are agreed upon the facts as set forth in the preceding summary narrative. The documents are available for all to consult. The manner of assembling and presenting them may differ as the writers differ, but the discrepancies are trifling and as often as not involuntary. The discussion of the causes, however, bristles with difficulties; contradictions abound and individual estimates are as various as they are divergent.

There are two main theories in conflict. It will be best to set them out with the arguments in their favour, for the reader to form his own opinion of their value and cogency.

The Protestant theory assumed from the very beginning and long maintained a peremptory and aggressive form, not inadequately summarized in the proud motto of Calvinist Geneva: *Post tenebras lux!* The Catholic Church was utterly corrupt. Christianity was bound in fetters. It was not only morals that left a great deal to be desired: doctrine, also, had been vitiated to the core. Dogma had been hideously distorted under the pressure of clerical greed and more particularly the ambition of Rome. The Pope really was Antichrist. Religion in his hands had degenerated into a merely sordid scheme of exploiting the faithful in all countries and procuring for Italian princelets, as devoid of scruple as they were full of cupidity, the necessary wherewithal to gratify their luxurious tastes or provide the sinews of their turbulent and self-seeking policies. A reform was urgently called for. It was achieved by a return to the one pure source of revealed truth—the Holy Bible.¹ Clericalism was

¹ Cf. on the point whether Catholicism, as it existed in the time of Luther and as it was confirmed by the Council of Trent, was a distortion of primitive Christianity or not, the decisive works of Bautifol, notably *L'Église naissante et le Catholicisme*, Paris, 1908. Modern Protestantism is obliged to admit that 'Capital elements of

overthrown The Word of God became available for every one Religion had been an exterior show it now became a devotion of the heart Ceremonies which overlaid and oppressed the divine rite were abolished. The worship of the Virgin and the Saints made way for the only lawful worship—of God and His Christ. The idolatry which was rampant in the sanctuary disappeared. After centuries of corruption and oblivion, God was at last served and honoured according to His Will We Protestants are therefore justly entitled to call our Churches the *reformed* or *evangelical* Churches

Hundreds of years have gone by This confident initial assurance has had to face many assaults The positions adopted by Luther and Calvin have been admitted to be untenable Nobody is now found willing to accept the absolute authority of the State or of the Calvinist Consistory Even the Bible, the object throughout so many years of such anxious scrutiny, has ceased to give any direct, reliable, decisive, uniform answer to the innumerable questions continually raised by the searches after truth Protestant doctrine, founded on the Bible and the Bible only, has continually altered Such is its instability that it defies all law, regulation, and prevision, so that one can never foretell what it may bring forth next The result has been to attribute credit and renown to Luther and Calvin for something they never sought, a thing they fought against with all their might and by every means, by the fire of the stake, by imprisonment, confiscation, exile *free examination*

The Protestant theory, as a result, has assumed the following new form· the principle of authority stifled the consciences of men. The clerical order, including the Pope, the bishops, the secular and regular clergy, tryannized over the laity by depriving them of the possession of the Scriptures in their homes. Then Luther appeared. He was only a ‘rude, rough Saxon boor’: he so described himself, ‘the peasant son of peasants’ He,

Catholicism date back to the Apostolic Age’ (Harnack) and is compelled to correct the Bible with the help of the ‘higher’ criticism by eliminating passages which favour the Catholic theory. To maintain that Protestantism represents the mind of our Lord involves the inevitable corollary that the Apostles did not understand the mind of their Master

too, lacked the sense of liberty. Nobody in his day had it. He left an authoritative Church to re-establish a State Church. It was a contradiction in terms, an absurdity. But we are grateful to him for having made a breach we cannot be angry with him for having been unable to rid himself entirely of the inheritance of the Middle Ages. The boldest men, the most audacious innovators, always bear the stamp of their time, their environment, their race. We are grateful to him for having thrown off the yoke which weighed so heavily on men's souls, for having given to all of them the Bible which sets men free, and for having set the personal example of an independence which in his own despite others were sure to claim. Even his State Church served a useful purpose. Princes could never exercise such despotism over consciences as Popes and bishops. The more conscientious a Pope, the more holy a bishop in the Catholic sense of the word, the more vigilant is he, the more apt to use his crook to bring wandering sheep back, willy-nilly, to the fold. A temporal prince, absorbed in the business of politics and administration, has too many matters on his hands not to leave the department of theology to look after itself more or less. Luther thus opened the door for the Protestant's most cherished possession to come forth, the gift of *liberty*.

This is the argument adopted by many historians with Protestant sympathies. A close scrutiny of the two forms taken by the theory just set forth shows that the latter destroys the former. If Luther and Calvin are to be applauded for having opened a breach in the barriers, for having transferred authority in things religious to princes incapable of exercising it in practice with any lasting effect—*the Lutheran system*—or to consistories whose harshness would end by provoking an irrepressible desire for freedom—*the Calvinist régime*—then the Popes and bishops of the Renaissance might in the same way be praised for having become gradually less interested in their specifically religious duties than in politics and the cultivation of the arts, for having, in a word, secularized themselves. If they had only gone farther along the path they seemed to have taken, they would have procured for the world at large, involuntarily and without realizing

it, and much more quickly than Luther and Calvin, that liberty which is proclaimed to be *par excellence* the most precious possession of the modern mind. Thus it might be argued that Luther and Calvin delayed the advent of that liberty for two hundred years. They created a new dogma as thorny, as uncompromising, as coercive, to say no more, as the old.

Their revolt led the Church to transform itself, to appoint the conscientious Popes and devoted bishops whose pious tyranny was so dreaded. Free examination within the Protestant churches became possible only through the secularization of their controlling authorities. It is therefore difficult to understand why non-Catholic historians should be so severe on the Popes and bishops of the Renaissance, the chief charge against whom was precisely that they had adopted a secularized policy.

But all this is beside the question. The most precious possession of souls is not liberty, but truth. Liberty is only a means; it is not an end. Either truth does not exist at all or truth is *one*. This is the conviction upon which Luther and Calvin, like all Catholics, insisted when they set up a standard of doctrine. This is the statement underlying the whole Gospel. Christ our Lord is 'the Truth'. Any man who denies it is not a Christian. To form a sound appreciation of the Protestant Revolution, the makers of it must be judged by what they willed to do and what they thought, by the objects which they set out to achieve and the purpose which guided them. If the first form of the Protestant theory above set forth is true, Luther and Calvin were heroes and saints, *true reformers*. If it is false, they are insurgent rebels and misguided men—even though history may put to their credit every extenuating circumstance it may consider available.

The Catholic theory (need it be said?) is implicit in the last few words. There is no denying that the Church suffered great and terrible abuses. That several of the Roman pontiffs were ill chosen, that unworthy bishops were appointed, that the prescriptions of Canon Law were constantly broken by the accumulation of benefices (pluralism), and the ignorance and immoral conduct of many priests, with a consequent general

lowering of morals and piety in the bosom of the Church, that superstition was rife among the people and degenerated often into mechanical routine, that disastrous fiscal methods and even simoniacal practices crept into the administration and government of the Church—all this is admitted without the least difficulty by Catholic historians. They deplore such scandals, to be sure, but they are not surprised or unduly shocked. Christ nowhere promised His Church impeccability. Wherever men are to be found, abuses will inevitably arise. God could have prevented them in His Church only by an uninterrupted succession of miracles. Ever since the time of Boniface VIII it has been realized that a Reform of the Church was needed, ‘in its head and in its members’ Reforms are continually necessary. We are ceaselessly overborne by the weight of our human nature. Every spiritual life is one continuous reformation. What is true of individuals is true also of corporations and the whole Church.

The ministers who surrounded Henry IV and discussed with him his return to the Roman Church were perfectly right in telling him, with reference to Luther and Calvin, that *the first reformers were wrong in making a section instead of a correction.*¹ A reform of the Church was practicable only from within, not from outside. It should have taken *moral*s and *discipline* for its province, not *dogma*, which had been in no way impaired. Luther and Calvin invented new dogmas. It was they who distorted Christianity. Justification by faith alone is not to be found in the Bible, nor predestination in the sense in which they understood it, nor their doctrine of original sin. But, most serious of all, there is no Biblical authority for Biblicalism. Nowhere in the Bible is the statement made that the Bible is the sole source of revealed truth. Nowhere is it recorded that Christ ever wrote or ordered His Apostles to write anything.² What, on the contrary, is declared is that Christ founded a visible, hierarchized, indefectible Church, infallible in virtue of His personal assistance until the consummation of the world.

¹ Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Histoire universelle*, Bk XIII, ch 24.

² He left no writings—once, and once only, we read of His writing a few words traced on the ground with a finger for a temporary purpose (St John viii 6-8).

Again, if Christ had entrusted His message to a book, He might (*salva reverentia*) be said to have been lacking in the most elementary foresight. He had under His own eyes an example of how a book can be abused. The Scriptures had been powerless to prevent the growth of incredulity among the Sadducees and hypocrisy among the Pharisees. The message of these very Scriptures was obscure even to men of goodwill like the Apostles. They understood nothing of the Messianism of the Prophets, as it was about to be realized by Christ. The novelty which Christ introduced into the world was the foundation of a Church, the bearer of His revelation, which the Holy Spirit was to safeguard from misrepresentation.

If the work which Luther and Calvin wrought was not divine, if they ran directly counter to the intention of our Lord, when they shattered the unity of the Church, some explanation, however, still remains to be given of the enormous success which they obtained, and this will put the inquirer on the track to the discovery of the real causes of the Protestant Revolution.

2 THE CAUSES OF THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION

The truth is that there are no causes in history in the sense in which we understand the word in reference to the physical sciences. There are only *responsible persons*. But when the responsibility is so widespread as to embrace whole multitudes, we describe it as a 'cause'. This, however, need not prevent us from setting in the forefront of causes the powerful personalities which have played a part in shaping events. The principal cause, then, of Lutheranism, in this sense, was Luther himself—with his temperament, his impetuous, excitable, headstrong, uncompromising character. So, too, the principal cause of Calvinism was Calvin. Lutheranism and Calvinism, unlike the doctrine of our Lord which is universal, bear the indelible stamp of obvious individual subjectivism. They are Christianity as seen through the eyes of Luther and Calvin under the influence of peculiar temporary circumstances. Therefore they have not survived the crisis which produced them. In other words, if we distinguish in Protestantism novel teaching and separation from

the earlier unity, the teaching of Luther and Calvin has long been superseded by other varieties of doctrine all that remains unchanged is the separation.

The doctrine of Luther, considered as novel teaching, had its origin, as has been seen, in the personal experiences of the Reformer. Even when he merely follows the current of earlier ideas, the irresistible pressure of Luther's exuberant temperament alters the course of the currents, giving it a new direction, a fresh significance. In this sense he must be considered as the first and principal cause of the doctrinal novelty called Lutheranism. The essential characteristic of his modifying influence on the systems of which his own retains some features in common, after exploiting them, whether consciously or not, is exaggeration. They were right who named him the *Doctor Hyperbolicus*. He is excessive in everything. Nominalism, for example, diminished the value of the human intellect, but such commonplace agnosticism was not sufficient for Luther. He felt the need to curse and blaspheme against the intellect, to treat it, in his own coarse words, as 'the devil's whore'. So though the Roman Curia of the day is only too justifiably open to censure, and particularly for allowing the greed for money to obtain so large an influence over ecclesiastical and religious policy, yet Luther passes all the bounds of legitimate indignation in describing the Roman Church as 'the whore of Babylon' and the Pope as 'Antichrist'. In the same order of ideas, if it be true to say that Luther adopted as his own the principle already laid down, before he appeared, of a recourse to the Bible, it is still true to say that he diverted that principle from its object and the field of its legitimate application.

As this is one of the most hotly debated points in the great controversy between Protestants and Catholics, it may be useful to examine it in some detail.

The glory of having aroused new interest in Biblical studies belongs not to the Protestant Revolution but to the Renaissance, a very different movement. Scholasticism, be it said, had never underrated the capital authority of Holy Scripture. It had always considered it as tacitly admitted that Scripture is the

principal channel—principal, not sole—of revelation. John Gerson was saying nothing really new when, about the beginning of the fifteenth century, he wrote these words '*Holy Scripture is the rule of faith. When it is well understood, no other authority ought to be admitted against it.* Neither the mind of any man, nor custom, nor a constitution, nor a habitual practice of whatever sort can prevail, if it be shown to be in opposition to Scripture.'¹

One of the results of the Renaissance had been a revival of the study of the text of the Scriptures. There was, of course, more than one current of ideas among the men of the time, and for far too many the new enthusiasm for the study of classical literature brought with it a development of semi-paganism.

But there was another and a better current of idealism that led sincere-minded scholars and leaders of the movement to see in it, not a mere return to a fountain-head of literary and artistic beauty, but also an inspiration for the renewal of sacred learning, and a zeal for the study of the Scriptures and the literature of the early ages of the Church. Humanism had thus its religious aspect. It was not only for its revival of classical studies that Leo X hailed it as the 'New Learning'.

The opening years of the sixteenth century everywhere offer the spectacle of a renewed zeal for the study of the Bible, without the least thought of any anti-Papal revolution. Long before Luther, Italy had seen Marsiglio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola devote themselves to the study of scripture with the help of the philology and philosophy of antiquity. Spain was to see Fray Ximenez de Cisneros of the Order of St Francis, better known as Cardinal Ximenes, and the group of his associates at the university of Alcala labouring in the preparation of the Complutensian Polyglot-Bible which finally appeared in 1520. In France Lefèvre d'Étaples, as has been seen, fired the enthusiasm of his numerous disciples by his Commentaries on the Psalms and the Epistles of St. Paul. In England John Colet and his friends gave the movement an impulse which was irresistible. It is a gross error to conceive of such activity as a sort of har-

¹ *Contra haeresim de communione sub utraque specie, Opera, 1* 457

binger of Protestantism, a kind of bridge, as it has been described, between Lollardy and Lutheranism. A few of the enthusiasts for the *New Learning* no doubt represent a theology which was on many points hesitant and stumbling. They belonged to a time of transition and uncertainty. But the movement might have had the happiest results. Their intentions were pure and upright. With them Biblical science was feeling its way. The advent of Luther provoked an upheaval. Scripture was distorted to serve a particular end.¹ The matter of greatest moment for him was to be free of the authority of the Pope and the Councils. The testimony of Scripture had to be obtained, at all costs, to a particular doctrine which was Luther's private discovery to meet the peculiar tendencies of his nature and temperament.

Even after his revolt, Humanism did not despair. Lefèvre d'Étaples, with the encouragement and support of Briçonnet, published his Commentaries on the Gospel and translated the New Testament and the Psalter into the vernacular. Erasmus, the representative of a very different tendency, but the uncrowned king of Humanism, boldly addressed an appeal to the Pope for the official sanction of a new theological method. He dedicated to him the second edition of his New Testament in Greek, and with reference thereto wrote to the Pope on the 13th August 1519,² from Louvain, as follows: 'Those who hitherto derived a certain muddy theology, cold as ice, from stinking sewers, to-day prefer to draw it from the crystal springs of Christ and His Apostles.'³ He exposed to Leo X the fanciful and interested fears of the now unpopular scholastics, who 'allege that the Christian religion is being endangered', and implored the Pope to intervene and allay the agitation of men's minds. It was a declaration that the study of the Bible did not necessarily involve a consequent revolt against him who acts as the head of the Church, as the centre of unity.

¹ Witness, e.g., Luther's 'faith alone' in his version of Romans iii. 28 and his daring reply to his critics—'If your Papist worries about the word *alone*, just tell him Dr Martin Luther will have it so.'

² Herminjart, op. cit., 1, no. 28, pp. 56-7.

³ The phraseology is characteristic of its writer's self-sufficient contempt for all the scholarship of the past.

It was Luther who turned all this movement awry, seeking to divert it to the benefit of his theories, to use it as a lever with which to influence the multitude. It is certain that, without the Bible, which he used as a weapon against the Papacy and Catholic dogma, he would have found the utmost difficulty in imposing his ideas. Yet it was not through the Bible alone that his teaching degenerated into a widespread revolt. The statement that the force of truth alone impelled so many enthusiastic disciples to follow in his footsteps would be a misleading simplification of the facts. There are distinctions to be made as to the motives of his followers.

Pride of place must be accorded to the *men of conviction*, to such, at any rate, as appear to have been influenced by conviction. They were carried away by Luther's theology, by his boldness in shouting at the top of his voice against Rome what many thought in their hearts. They attached themselves to the Reformer, made common cause with him throughout the critical time, only to leave him again, more or less openly, once the danger was past. Such was Carlstadt, and he became one of the bitterest opponents of Luther. Melanchthon, too, had been carried away by the torrential force of Lutheran doctrine. He later modified it, in private, on a number of essential points, without venturing so far as openly to break with the master.

Many other names might be cited of those who followed Luther because his theology, for all its personal and subjective character, brought them that 'consolation' which it was, in a way, the fashion of the moment to seek amid the worries of a conscience haunted by the brooding obsession of sin and the fear of Hell. The idea of 'consolation' recurs, as has been seen, like a refrain among the theologians of Protestantism.

A second group, ever so much less worthy of respect, is formed by the swarms of monks and degenerate priests who saw in the revolution only an opportunity, long cherished in secret, of getting rid of onerous obligations which had grown too irksome. Luther was not disposed to affection for that horde of unworthy adherents who hailed him for their leader, but for whom the Gospel was a mere excuse and cloak for immorality.

I perceive [he wrote to John Lang on the 28th March 1522] that many of our monks leave their convents simply for the same reason as they went in, for their bellies' sake and carnal licence, and Satan will make use of them to raise a mighty stench against our teaching¹

Later in the same letter he made the admission that the new Gospel he had discovered had not worked any great moral improvement in his own case

The influence of the Word is still hidden or continues of slight effect in us all, which surprises me mightily we are indeed no different from what we were before, hard-hearted, without bowels, impatient, foolhardy, drunken, lecherous, and quarrelsome: the fact is that charity, that symbol and characteristic of Christians, is nowhere to be seen amongst us and the word of St Paul is fulfilled· we have the kingdom of God in word but not in deed²

The remarkable thing is that both the secular and regular clergy in the countries which went over to Lutheranism should have joined the revolt in such large numbers There was no John Fisher or Thomas More in Germany.

Luther recruited a third class of adherents in the bourgeoisie of the towns and among the princes. It is hard to believe that the predominant motive determining the princes to abandon the Church was theological It would rather appear that a sort of nationalism, exasperated by the extortions of the Roman Curia but also masquerading under the cloak of Biblicalism, was a more effective determinant than any other consideration. National feeling ran high in the early years of the sixteenth century in Germany It assumed in many minds the form of a violent but latent antagonism to the authority, often tactlessly and clumsily exercised, over the national Churches by the representatives of the Holy See The Germans chafed at being subject in religious matters to Italians, whom they accused, not infrequently with truth, of turning religion into an instrument of oppression and the exploitation of peoples. It must be borne in mind that Germany in the beginning of the sixteenth century was economically very prosperous. The towns, whose riches

¹Enders, *w*, pp. 323-4.

² loc. cit.

formed a striking contrast to the misery of the countryside, boasted a leisured, cultivated, burgess class, eager for learning, interested in the arts and the progress of science, in whom contact with the orators and historians of antiquity had highly developed the feeling of country and the idea of the State, as distinct from the Church.

Luther had only to give the signal and the burgess class responded with enthusiasm. He himself received from his nation an impulse no less violent in its intensity than the impulse he gave to Germany. The sound of his voice surprised and swept him off his feet as it came back to him amplified by the echoing reverberations of a united people. Proof that what men most expected of him was German revenge upon the Italians may be found in the applause which greeted the publication of the theses in 1517, criticising Indulgences for creating a feeling of 'security' among Christians, and the further applause, the following year, when he raised the same 'security' to the dignity of an article of faith by making the assured conviction of salvation the main dogma of the new religion. Luther might say what he chose: he was greeted with rapturous applause provided that he thundered against Rome.

National sentiment was not so well defined among the princes. They had another reason for taking Luther under their patronage. By so doing they fortified their position against the Emperor, and their hope was to increase their domains with the spoils of the Church. It may be considered as certain that, if Luther had not received the support of the princes, the towns, and in a measure the whole nation, he would have ended like John Huss. But Luther's friends, his partisans and patrons of every kind, were proud of being able to give a religious complexion and a Biblical confirmation to the political and mundane ambitions which had impelled them to adopt a heresy and create a schism.

To sum up the position adopted by Luther could only be defended if it were proved that corruption had so far penetrated the Church that doctrine also had become contaminated. No evidence to that effect has ever been forthcoming. The doctrine

of the Catholic Church is bound by one continuous uninterrupted chain to the doctrine of the Fathers and the Apostles. It has not changed it cannot change The doctrine of Luther and Calvin has been subjected unceasingly to the most substantial alterations Now it is a mere exhibit fit only for a museum of antiquity If they spoke the truth, why has their philosophy not been preserved intact? If they were deceived, why should they be considered as the 'Reformers' of Christianity?

The investigation of the 'causes' of the Protestant Revolution may be usefully completed by a recapitulatory exposition of the influences at work in that portentous movement.

3 RECAPITULATORY EXPOSITION OF THE CAUSES OF THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION

The causes may be divided into three categories: (a) the religious, intellectual, and moral; (b) those predominantly political in character; (c) those determined by the state of society in the sixteenth century.

(a) Religious, intellectual, and moral causes the decadence of scholasticism, which ended in little more than mere verbal logic-chopping, ill-corrected by a mysticism which denied the importance of reason and occasionally lost in the clouds of pantheism and theological fatalism, laxity of discipline among the clergy in all ranks of the hierarchy, the growing prevalence of luxury and immorality in the Christian world and, in addition, new intellectual currents issuing from the development of Humanism which, although lacking a fixed canon of interpretation, rightly advocated the study of the Bible.

(b) Political causes the growth of absolutism in England, France, and Spain with, for indirect consequence, the decline of an over-secularized Papacy, excessively embroiled in politics, and thereby degraded almost to the status of a small Italian principality, and the decline of the Empire owing to the parceling out of Germany and the desire of local princes to arrogate to themselves in their own States the absolute power which neighbouring kings were assuming through the decadence of the old feudal system. The advent of high diplomacy, by reducing

affairs of State to the level of mere dynastic or national self-interested calculation, assisted the spread of Protestantism, which rapidly became a main piece on the political chess-board of Empire. The reason why Charles V was unable to lance the Lutheran abscess was that German particularism supported by French diplomacy, with the Turkish peril imminent in the background, offered him a tenacious resistance which was in the end triumphant.

(c) Lastly, from the social point of view, the prosperous economic situation of the towns and the primitive backwardness of the countryside provided Luther with recruits of divers kinds. The citizens of the towns flocked to his banner because he pandered to their nationalism the peasants because he fired their aspirations A needy proletariat had grown up amongst the nobility, the clergy, and the populace All the bitterness which had gathered in the hearts of those who suffered from the state of society found an outlet in attacking, at Luther's clarion call, what the Reformer of Wittenberg described as 'the tyranny of Rome'.

PART II

THE CATHOLIC REACTION

CHAPTER I

THE REFORM EFFECTED BY THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS

Summary 1. The Oratory of Divine Love and the Theatines 2. The Somascans and the Barnabites 3. Other Catholic Reformers—the Capuchins 4. Ignatius Loyola and the Society of Jesus 5. St Angela Merici and the Ursulines

I THE ORATORY OF DIVINE LOVE AND THE THEATINES

THE Catholic Reform is usually described as the 'Counter-Reformation,' as though it had no other object than to oppose the Protestant 'Reformation' and was a mere reply to the challenge of that movement. Such a conception does it less than justice. Reformers have never failed the Catholic Church even in its most trying days. There were reformers in the fifteenth century as in all the preceding ages. Attempts at reform in the full Catholic sense had been made before Luther in every country in Christendom. In France Mombaer, Standonck, the Benedictine preacher, Jean Raulin, and many more were true reformers. Briçonnet merely carried on the work they had begun. In Spain the great Franciscan Cardinal Ximenes obtained memorable results. The Latran Council, which held its closing session on the 16th March 1517, the very year in which Luther published his famous theses against Indulgences, had drawn up a complete programme of reform. Unfortunately there was a heavy load to be lifted. Reform was a word on everybody's lips; they were few who thought seriously of putting it into practice.

Yet the beginnings of a religious Order, destined to accomplish a work of great importance, date from that same year, 1517. While the vociferous reformers of the Lutheran group were busy destroying the unity of Christendom at Wittenberg on the pretext of reforming the Church, a little company of

priests and clerics was drawing together in Rome itself, the city so heartily cursed by Luther, and silently, without noise or ostentation, carrying out the reform which everybody talked about, but which most people kept postponing until the morrow.

This Society was known as the Oratory of Divine Love¹ and consisted of men of exceptional secular attainments and solid virtue. Their number increased in time to some fifty or sixty distinguished members, and included humanists of the highest distinction such as Jacopo Sadoletto, bishop of Carpentras, a future cardinal. One of the most edifying and active members of the little band was a young priest from Vicenza, Count Gaetano da Thiene, of an old Venetian noble family. Born about 1480, he had studied at Padua and was not ordained until the age of thirty-six. Sweet-tempered, unassuming, and generous, Gaetano devoted eight hours a day to prayer. He was permeated with the ideals of the Gospel devotion to souls, the spirit of penance, of prayer, of spotless purity. He was later to be called 'the hunter of souls'.

He described himself as 'a poor worm of earth, mere dust and ashes', while the Protestant historian Ranke records that it was said of him. 'that he wished to reform the world, but without having it known that he was in the world'²

Side by side with him, about that time, went a young prelate, his elder by four years, whose ardent, austere character formed a striking contrast with the other's mildness and timidity, but who, less deliberate and diffident, was no less devoured with zeal

¹ The principal source for the history of the Company or Oratory of the Divine Love and the Theatines is A. Caracciolo's *De vita Pauli IV*, Cologne, 1612. Cf also Pastor's *History of the Popes*, vol. x of the English edition (1910), p. 390 (note).

The *Oratorio all' Divino Amore* was founded at Genoa in 1497 and transferred to Rome under Leo X. It therefore anteceded Lutheranism by twenty years at least. See Tacchi Venturi, *Storia delle compagnie di Gesù in Italia*, Roma, 1910, p. 406 et seq.

² Leopold von Ranke, *Die Romische Papste*, vol. 1, Berlin, 1834, at p. 114. The translation is by Mrs Austin, Macaulay's 'accomplished lady who as an interpreter between the mind of Germany and the mind of Britain deserved so well of both countries' at p. 117 of vol. 1 of his *Collected Essays* in the essay on *The Popes of Rome*, 3rd ed., London, 1847. Ranke quotes Caracciolo's *Vita S. Cajetani Thienati*, ch. ix, p. 101. 'He was humble, mild and modest in conversation, sparing of words and I remember often seeing him in tears while saying his prayers', Ranke does not name the author of the observation in the text. Pastor merely quotes Ranke, op. cit., p. 401.

and fired with enthusiasm for the reform of the clergy and the Church. His name was Giovanni Pietro Caraffa. He came of a noble Neapolitan family and, since 1504, had been bishop of Chieti in the Abruzzi. He apparently first conceived the idea of transforming the Oratory of Divine Love from a pious confraternity meeting for spiritual exercises in the little church of SS. Silvestro and Dorotea in Trastevere into a special company of Clerks Regular, established under a strict rule, leading a community life, and directly subject to the Holy See

The foundation of this new Order dates from the 24th June 1524. The Clerks were called Theatines from the Latin name (*Theate*) of the bishopric of Chieti, Caraffa's titular see. Their advent marks an epoch in monastic life. In early times all monks were laymen. In the Middle Ages monasteries included both priests, who were called Fathers, and laymen, designated Brothers. Many congregations of Clerks Regular were to spring up in modern times free from any obligation to sing the office in choir and consisting only of priests. The Theatines were the first example of such an organization (soon to be adopted by the Jesuits). They formed an Order bound by solemn vows, taking, more particularly, an almost heroic vow of absolute poverty, without fixed income, which was to involve them, especially in the beginning, in many sore trials.

The Theatines never increased to any large numbers, but they none the less rendered the greatest service to the Church. They inaugurated in the sixteenth century the urgently needed reform of the clergy. They were 'not indeed properly a seminary of priests, but', says Ranke, they 'gradually grew into a seminary of bishops'. The Order . . . became in time the Order of priests peculiar to the nobility and, as it had been remarked from the beginning that the new members were of noble extraction, at a later period, proofs of nobility were, in some places, requisite for admission.'¹

Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, their founder, became Pope under the name of Paul IV. We shall meet him later. His friend and

¹ Cf Ranke, op. cit., vol. 1, at pp. 118-19, and Pastor, op. cit., p. 418. Pastor refers to Bromato's *Storia di Paolo IV*, Ravenna, 1748, 1. 111.

156 REFORM EFFECTED BY THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS
fellow worker Gaetano da Thiene, an indefatigable apostle with the reputation of a miracle worker, is venerated as a saint by the Church Another remarkable saint of the Order was Andrea Avellino who, having been a lawyer, became a religious, led a life of humility and mortification, was an admirable contemplative, an eloquent preacher, a wise director of souls with a far-reaching influence in Italy. He attracted to the Order Lorenzo Scupoli, a famous ascetical writer and the author of a little book entitled *The Spiritual Combat*, which the gentle St Francis of Sales esteemed above all other works of edification and which has been translated into many languages Scupoli gave in his own life the example of the humility and perfect submission to the will of God which he preached to others The victim of atrocious calumnies, he was condemned by the chapter-general of his Order to take his place for a time among the laity and accepted the undeserved humiliation with the most affecting sentiments of resignation His beautiful book was the outcome of a trial nobly endured (1509)

The example of Giambattista Giberti, bishop of Verona, affords the best illustration of the reforming activity exercised by the Oratory of Divine Love and the Theatine Order which sprang from it.

Giberti was a native of Palermo. He was born in 1495, and while still a boy entered the service of Cardinal Giulio de' Medici as secretary He was of a pious disposition, devoted to his work and his master He had attended the *Oratory* from the beginning and became associated with Caraffa and Gaetano da Thiene, whose virtues he admired When Cardinal Giulio de' Medici became Pope under the name of Clement VII, Giberti was appointed to the bishopric of Verona. He would have devoted himself entirely to his diocese, but the Pope retained him in his service at Rome.

Before long there came an event which impressed everybody, even more than the rise of Protestantism, as a peremptory warning from Providence that an immediate, genuine reform brooked no delay; Rome was captured and put to the sack by the troops of Charles V, led by the notorious Constable de

Bourbon, a traitor to his king and country (6th May 1527). The Constable was killed while climbing the wall and Philibert, prince of Orange, took over the command. The Lutheran soldiers, who formed the vast majority of the invaders, made the death of Bourbon a pretext for taking revenge in unheard of excesses, pillage, and profanation. For eight days the sack continued, a saturnalia of horrors. The population of Rome had been roughly estimated before the capture at 55,000. 4,000 perished in the sack of the city. All who were able fled, and the deserted city was abandoned to the soldiery. Giberti was one of those who took to heart the lesson of events. He was thrown into prison, and there made a vow to amend an already exemplary life, to take up residence in his diocese as soon as he recovered his liberty, and thenceforth to devote the rest of his life to the spiritual welfare of the faithful committed to his care. He kept his vow. He was no sooner freed from prison than he made his way to Venice, whither the Theatines had fled for safety, and thence resumed his journey to Verona. A year later an impartial observer wrote

The clergy of this diocese are disciplined to the highest degree. They have all to undergo an examination and the unworthy or incapable are suspended from their functions or removed. The prisons are full of guilty clerics. Preaching to the people is carried on without ceasing. Studies are fostered and encouraged. The bishop in his own life sets the highest example.¹

Giberti laboured at his apostolic work in his diocese for fifteen years. By a system of regular visitations and careful supervision of the lives of his clergy he succeeded in making Verona a model diocese. His reforming ordinances were to serve as a model for the disciplinary work of the Council of Trent. He was one of the nine 'selected cardinals and other prelates' who presented Paul III, in 1537, with the sweeping programme of reforms contained in the famous *Consilium . . . de emendanda ecclesia*. Giberti had given the first impulse. The number of bishops who followed in his footsteps increased with the years. St. Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, the

¹ M Sanuto, *Diaru*, Venice (1886-1903) Cf vol xlix at p. 161.

great reformer of northern Italy, drew his inspiration from the memory of the pious bishop of Verona

2 THE SOMASCANS AND THE BARNABITES

Another hero of Christian charity in sixteenth-century Italy who came under the influence of the Oratory of Divine Love and the Theatines was Girolamo Emiliano. The son of a Venetian senator, he had been a soldier and lived, more or less, the life of his brothers in arms, the loose life of the camp, until about the age of thirty-five. A sojourn in prison gave him, like Giberti, the opportunity for reflection. The trial was in his case, as in that of many another saintly character, the occasion for the grace of conversion. Recovering his liberty in almost miraculous fashion, he was inspired by one thought only—to expiate his offences by penance and works of charity towards his neighbour. It was about the time when Luther was thundering against good works. Girolamo Emiliano considered that the only means of sanctifying himself and atoning for the sins of his adventurous youth was to put into practice the great precept of the Gospel. ‘Love you one another as I also have loved you.’ One is inevitably moved to ask on which side was the true ‘return to the Gospel’ which Luther unceasingly proclaimed. Girolamo’s spiritual adviser was Giovanni Pietro Caraffa. The frightful misery which befell northern Italy as a result of the capture of Rome directed him to his definitive vocation. Famine and plague were added to the horrors and ravages of war. Girolamo spent himself without reckoning in visiting the sick and burying the corpses of the dead which littered the highway, in ministering encouragement, consolation, and support to the utmost of his power to every sufferer. He was attacked by typhus while tending contagious cases, but recovered and devoted his few remaining years of life—he died in 1537—to founding a society similar to the Theatines, that is to say, composed of Clerks Regular but specially intended for the superintendence and administration of orphanages, and hospitals. This congregation took its name from the little village of Somasca, near Bergamo in the Milanese, which became its centre.

More far-reaching still was the influence of Antonio Maria Zaccaria, born in Cremona in 1512. He had been a doctor and was not ordained priest until the age of twenty-six. He also was profoundly affected by the calamities of the time and devoted himself entirely to the service of souls in his native city. He went to Milan at the end of 1530 and was there joined by a few priests, men of the same ideals. Among these were Bartolomeo Ferrari and Jacopo Morigia, both noblemen like himself. Together they founded a congregation of Clerks Regular, the Order of the Sons of St Paul, subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop. They were known as Barnabites from the original seat of their community in the ancient monastery of St Barnabas in Milan, and they took for their model the evangelizing zeal of the Apostle.

It is difficult in this connexion not to recall that Luther also invoked the authority of St Paul. A wide difference, however, separates the acts and sentiments of each, a great gulf divides the peaceful lives of Zaccaria and his brethren from the feverish and tormented existence of the 'Reformer of Wittenberg', perpetually at war with somebody or something.

3 OTHER CATHOLIC REFORMERS—THE CAPUCHINS

Whilst Germany, at Luther's call, furnished a multitude of workers in the cause of religious revolution, Italy, which had been the first to give the signal of decline, was also the first to give the signal of a real revival. Besides the names just mentioned, a host of others contributed the help of their energy and zeal to the work of reform. The Blessed Paolo Giustiniani continued to render illustrious a name already made famous in the annals of his native Venice and in the history of Christian piety, by his reforming, in 1520, the Camaldoleses, an offshoot of the Benedictines founded by St Romuald in the eleventh century at Monte Corona, near Perugia. Luther's own order, the Augustinians, under the influence of the learned Giles of Viterbo, theologian, preacher, poet, humanist, and eminent philologist, exercised the happiest reforming influence. Giles had been elected General of the Order in 1509. Luther may

have attended his lectures with the future Cardinal Seripando when he made his visit to Rome in 1510-11. But his doctrine of grace and justification was to be a mere distortion of the teaching given according to the tradition of his Order by Giles of Viterbo and destined to be presented at the Council of Trent by the illustrious Seripando. It was Giles of Viterbo who delivered the opening address at the Lateran Council in 1512. He had then expressed himself in terms to which his Saxon pupil was to give the lie. Giles on that occasion, had, in Pastor's words, 'simply and succinctly summed up the theory of true Catholic reformation' by insisting that 'Men must be changed by religion, and not religion by men.'¹

Another humanist theologian, Gregorio Cortese, abbot of San Giorgio Maggiore, a future cardinal and member of the commission of nine who drew up the *Concilium de emendanda ecclesia* in anticipation of the Council of Trent, applied himself in his capacity of visitor-general of the Monte Cassino congregation to recalling the Benedictine Order to its early ideals and impressed upon it the duty of supporting the Church by its learning.

But it was among the Franciscans especially that the touching spirit of simplicity and ardent zeal which animated the *Poverello* of Assisi was to revive. As early as 1517, at a time when Luther's revolt against Rome was not complete, had hardly even begun, friaries had been established which were specially set apart for religious desirous of observing a stricter discipline. Matteo de Bascio (1459-1552) was the zealous promoter of the reform thus inaugurated. He had joined the Franciscans of the Strict Observance at the age of seventeen. They and the Conventuals, whose rule was less severe, formed the two branches of the great Order of St Francis. Matteo first attracted attention as a popular preacher in the March of Ancona, his own country, and then by his self-sacrificing heroism during the plague at Camerino in 1523. Two years later he made the jubilee pilgrimage to Rome and obtained the

¹ Cf. Pastor, op. cit., vol. viii at p. 10. Pastor quotes from Harduin's *Collectio regia maxima conciliorum*, Paris, 1700-16, ix. 1576.

sanction of Pope Clement VII to his wearing the long pointed cowl or hood (Italian *cappuccio*, *cappuccino*), which was to be emblematic of the Capuchins, from that time onward a third branch of the Franciscan Order.

Matteo's disciples lived at first as hermits. They were officially approved on the 3rd July 1528, and still remained nominally bound to the Conventuals. The bond was broken in 1619, when Pope Paul V granted the Capuchins full independence and declared that they were entitled to call themselves true sons of St. Francis. The new Order, however, had many difficulties to contend with in its early days. Matteo de Bascio had become vicar-general of the Capuchins in 1529. In 1537 he returned to the Franciscans of the Strict Observance. A much more severe blow was dealt them by their fourth vicar-general, Bernardino Ochino of Siena. Ochino was celebrated all through Italy as a preacher, a fiery apostle of penance, a famous spiritual director whom Paul III was on the point of raising to the cardinalate in 1542, when he caused a sensational scandal by apostatizing. He received a summons to appear before the newly established tribunal of the Inquisition and was on his way to Rome when at Florence he fell in with another Italian religious, Pietro Vermigli, surnamed the Martyr, an ex-Augustinian, who persuaded him to fly with him to Zurich. The couple were warmly welcomed by the Swiss reformers and later played a part in disseminating the new doctrines in England under Edward VI.¹ The Capuchin Order surmounted all their various difficulties and towards the end of the sixteenth century began to spread outside Italy and bear remarkable fruit in piety and learning. In the second half of the century a simple lay brother, Felix de Cantalice, surprised the most erudite theologians by his learning in the divine mysteries and

¹ Ochino arrived in London with his companion in December 1547, and six months later was provided by Cranmer with a non-residentary prebend in the church of Canterbury, which he lost on the accession of Mary. He retired to Basel, but in the end, abandoned by everybody, died a lonely death at Schlackau in Moravia, in 1564. His companion, more familiar to English readers as Peter Martyr, lectured in Oxford, but on Mary's accession was expelled. He went first to Strasbourg, then in 1555 to Zurich, where on the 12th November 1562 he died.

gave counsel, at their own request, to such men as Charles Borromeo and Philip Neri.

St Lawrence of Brindisi, another Capuchin and general of his Order, was reckoned among the most famous linguists of his day. He could speak ten languages, knew the Bible by heart in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, could preach to the Jews in their own tongue and made many converts among them. He was among the opponents of the Protestant propaganda in Germany and took part in a great crusade against the Turks which ended in the signal victory of Stuhlweissenburg (Szekes-Fejervar) in Hungary on the 11th October 1601.

A Capuchin was the first prefect of the celebrated Congregation of Propaganda, founded to spread the Faith when in 1622 it was organized in its permanent form.¹ Its first martyr was a Capuchin, St Fidelis of Sigmaringen, who fell a victim to the hatred of Calvinist soldiers on the 24th April 1622 while preaching in a church at Sevis in the Grisons. He was canonized in 1746.

St Joseph of Leonissa, another great preacher of the Order, escaped death at the hands of the Turks only by almost a miracle. He died in 1612. San Serafino di Montegranaro (1540–1604) was a contemplative. He spent his nights in ecstasy before the Blessed Sacrament and emerged from his raptures only in order to succour his neighbour. Despite the poverty of his monastery, he found means of showing inexhaustible charity to the poor. In 1643 the Capuchins reckoned 1,379 houses and 21,000 religious. The Conventuals at the same time numbered 30,000 and the Observants of various kinds, or Reformed Franciscans, 163,000. There was thus a great army still assembled under the banner of St Francis.

4 IGNATIUS LOYOLA AND THE SOCIETY OF JESUS

Despite the immense achievements of Capuchins, Theatines, Somascans, and Barnabites, to say nothing of the older Orders, historians have agreed in assigning a preponderant part in the great work of Catholic Reform to St. Ignatius Loyola.

¹ It had been originally organized by Gregory XIII as a Commission of Cardinals, it was given the status and full organization of a Papal congregation by Gregory XV in 1622.

and the Society of Jesus The Jesuits, however, were not the first, as they were not the most numerous, in the struggle against Protestantism But they were so strongly organized, so efficiently disciplined by their founder that it has become the custom to regard them as eminently representative of the Catholic principle of obedience to lawfully constituted authority in so far as that authority is recognized as expressing the will of God. The Protestant historian Ranke had no hesitation in comparing the reforming groups of the Oratory of Divine Love and the Theatines with the groups which gathered round Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg When he comes to Ignatius Loyola, he compares him with Luther himself, as also does Macaulay, but the attempt to trace the likeness is more ingenious than well founded There are some remote points of resemblance, however, if not between the two men, at all events between their religious experiences But the paths they chose were divergent because their minds and hearts were illuminated in different ways

Don Iñigo Lopez de Recalde was born about 1491—the precise date is not known—in a valley of the Basque hill country, far from the noise of the world. He was the youngest of the eleven children of Bertram de Loyola and Marina Salcz de Baldi, his wife. The family could claim an ancient and noble lineage The ancestral castle, a few miles distant from the village of Azpeitia in the province of Guipuzcoa in northern Spain, is now enclosed in a wing of the great college of Loyola. It was a small castle with massive walls, two stories high, which must have resembled closely the modest manor-houses of the country. The child received at baptism the name of Iñigo—a Spanish Benedictine saint—but later, out of devotion to St. Ignatius of Antioch, adopted the name by which he is usually known From 1537 onwards, he subscribed himself at one time Iñigo, at another Ignatius, but after 1543, Ignatius always

He grew up in the wild and desolate valley in which he was born until on the threshold of youth he entered the service, as a page, of Juan Velasquez, a noble friend of the family who was also grand treasurer to Ferdinand the Catholic. His education

was limited, according to the custom of the time for men of his degree, to reading and writing. On the death of Juan Velasquez he joined the household of the Duke de Najera, viceroy of Navarre. Iñigo at that time was a typical Spanish knight, with a passion for glory and honour, dreaming of heroic adventures and epic battles, devoted to the Catholic Faith, a sacred legacy he had inherited from his forefathers, but no less addicted to the secular pursuits common among his comrades and his class. He was not averse from gaming, and it would appear that still more dangerous passions obtained some lodging in his heart.

War broke out between Francis I and Charles V in the month of May 1521, and the French, crossing the Pyrenees, laid siege to Pampeluna. The other leaders in command of the beleaguered garrison would have gladly surrendered. Ignatius alone declared for holding out to the end. The town capitulated only after a cannon ball had fractured his thigh. After some surgical treatment he was conveyed to the castle of Loyola, where it was discovered that the bone had been badly set. It had to be broken again—a painful operation which he bore unflinchingly. The only indication Ignatius gave of his agony was a violent gesture with his fist. A long and painful convalescence followed, and the invalid asked for books to relieve the weariness of the time. All they could find to give him was a volume of *Lives of the Saints* in Spanish and a translation of the *Life of Christ* by the Carthusian Ludolph of Saxony.¹ This reading gradually took hold of his mind. God

¹ Ludolph was a writer of the fourteenth century. He began his religious life as a Dominican, and then passed to the Carthusian Order, where he spent his later years (1340–77). His chief work, the fruit of prayer and study in this long period of contemplative seclusion, is his *Vita Christi*. It is not simply a Life of Christ in the form of a biography based on the Gospels. Ludolph draws freely on the commentaries of the Fathers, and the meditations of devotional and ascetical writers on the Scripture record. The book in its manuscript form extended to four folio volumes. It was soon translated into many European languages. It was widely circulated in manuscript form and then in numerous printed editions, the latest of these produced in our own time. St Teresa and St Francis of Sales quote it and write in its praise. It may be regarded as one of the world's famous books, and its production and popularity from the second half of the fourteenth century may be taken as one more proof that the Gospels were not neglected and all but unknown until Luther's activities in the early years of the sixteenth century.

and the world were doing battle for his soul. 'For two, three, and four hours on end', he later told P. Gonsalvez, 'he considered what feats of arms he might perform in the service of a lady.' Then tiring of such day-dreams, back he would go to his lives of the saints. 'Supposing', he said to himself, 'I were to do what St Francis and St. Dominic have done.'

Ignatius, whose mind was gifted with a rare power of concentration, gradually came to perceive that while worldly ambitions were powerless to allay the agitation of his heart, spiritual aspirations expanded and rejoiced his soul.

Like Luther he sought to discover a meaning in his mental experiences. But while Luther, obsessed with the thought of sin, read Scripture only to find in it, under the impulse of his craving for interior tranquillity, a proof that divine law is not intended to bind us but rather to drive us to despair and throw us bruised and distracted into the arms of Jesus, Who saves us of His grace by faith without good works, Ignatius did not seek to evade the binding obligation of the Law. He considered that the joy which dilated the heart of the good servant was sent from God, while the distress which prevented the fulfilment of the divine command was the work of the Devil. This reflection became one of the principles which inspired his famous rules regarding the 'discernment of spirits', the method of distinguishing between good and evil influences on mind and will.

Ignatius emerged from his reveries and inward struggles a changed man. He abandoned the profession of arms and resolved to become a knight in the service of God. As soon as he was restored to health, early in 1522, he took the road which great saints had trod before him. He bade farewell to his family and betook himself to the famous shrine of Our Lady at Montserrat. There, secluded in a wilderness among the rocks, he reviewed his youth and in a careful confession, to which he devoted three days, broke with the past and prepared for his new career. He gave his knightly apparel to a beggar, hung his sword up on an altar of the Blessed Virgin, and taking leave of the world, devoted himself to the service of the sick in a hospital in the little neighbouring town of Manresa.

He was still a mere novice in the knowledge of spiritual things. Of his reading in the *Lives of the Saints*, what he chiefly retained was a high regard for the practice of exterior mortification. His goodwill and energy in outward acts of penance were marvellous. He begged his bread, fasted for whole weeks except on Sundays, scourged himself three times a day, approached the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion once a week, attended Mass and Vespers daily, and chose a neighbouring cave for his dwelling and the scene of his prayers and penances.

A danger of such a course of life was the risk of its degenerating into the eccentricities of spurious asceticism. Ignatius, however, was the soul of docility, and the advice of his confessor enlightened his path and signal graces rewarded his obedience. God Himself became, in Ignatius' own words, 'his school-master'. A profound illumination was then vouchsafed him. We have his own authority that he often said of himself later. 'Even if we had not the Holy Scriptures to teach us the truths of faith, I should have still determined to lay down my life for those same truths, solely in consequence of the things that I have seen.'¹

It is impossible not to notice the great part played in such a life by supernatural guidance. The Catholic Church is sometimes accused of hostility to the direct inspiration of God and of seeking to prevent the action of the Holy Ghost in the world. The whole history of the Church is a protest against such an allegation. The Church recognizes the fact that God does on occasions communicate directly with the individual soul. She is satisfied to test all claims to direct mystical experience by comparing them with the certain data of revelation. The history of the different Protestant sects, on the contrary, is one perpetual oscillation between the literal interpretation of the Bible and an unbridled illuminism. At Manresa, in his intimate conversations with God, St Ignatius gathered the ideas which guided him and formed the plans he realized in future years.²

¹ Cf. Autobiography, No. 30.

² See Astrain's *Short Life of St Ignatius*, p. 62, *Historia de la Compañía*, 1. 102.

Manresa, in a sense, may be said to be the birthplace of the Society of Jesus, for it sprang directly from a little book composed at Manresa, one of the most remarkable books in history, a book which ever since its appearance has exercised the most far-reaching effects and still continues to influence the minds of men the *Spiritual Exercises*

Speaking later of the origin of his book, Ignatius told P. Gonsalvez

One day he [Ignatius himself] was going in devotion to a church about a mile distant from Manresa. The church is dedicated, I believe, to St. Paul. The road goes alongside a river. Absorbed in meditation, he sat down for a while, gazing at the water flowing at his feet. As he sat there the eyes of his mind began to open. It was not a vision that he beheld, but he understood and realized many things, things spiritual, things of faith and learning, and in such a flood of illumination that they seemed to take a completely new aspect. It is impossible to say what particular things he thus understood, although they were many, only that he received a great illumination in his understanding so that, when he considers all the various kinds of assistance he received from God and all the things he learned in the course of his life up to the age of sixty-two years past and gathers them together into one whole, it seems to him that the sum total of them does not amount to what he received at that time.¹

Luther was fond of discoursing upon the illuminations which he had received in 1518 in the Tower of the Black Convent—his *Turmerlebnis*. Ignatius also was visited by one of those sudden intuitions which men call flashes of genius, but which religion teaches us proceed from God. The two famous illuminations would furnish an excellent case for the application of the admirable rules prescribed by the founder of the Society of Jesus ‘for the discernment of minds’

It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that the *Spiritual Exercises* were the unexpected, suddenly matured fruit of some supernatural revelation, quite without preparation in the natural order. Ignatius certainly made use of an earlier work, the *Exercitatorio de la vida espiritual* of Dom Garcia de Cisneros,

¹ Cf. *Autobiography*, loc. cit.

the Benedictine abbot of Montserrat, published in 1500, and may have borrowed its title *The Imitation of Christ* and the *Life of Christ*, by Ludolph the Carthusian, also provided him with important elements for his work, or rather a starting-point for his meditations. The whole needed to be informed, however, by his personal experience and enlightened by vivid flashes of illumination which Ignatius attributed to God Himself.

The book of the *Exercises* contains what may be described as the complete account of the attitude towards practical life which the Catholic Faith ought to induce in its possessor. Its main object is 'to regulate life', to put man face to face with his end, which is 'to praise the Lord His God, to reverence and serve Him so that he shall be saved', and to help him in the essential task of 'election', that is to say, the choice of the road leading to such an end. The essential character of Ignatian spirituality is already apparent in the word 'election'. St. Ignatius is well aware of the preponderant part played by divine grace in the work of our sanctification. But as Luther inclined to quietism, that is to say to the denial of the human collaboration of the will with grace, so Ignatius felt the necessity (and he was as yet entirely ignorant of Luther's novel doctrine) of insisting upon the crucial importance of the decisions made by our free will in presence of the divine summons. Ignatian 'election', in other words, is simply 'vocation' considered from the standpoint of man's will. And in Ignatian spirituality a distinction is made between the election of vocation and the election of amendment which implies that spiritual progress is always achieved by the correction of the will.

St Ignatius' desire is to teach men to construct or restore their lives. He starts from the principle that God is God, that all things converge in Him, that He alone is the ultimate end of all created beings, that the motto of every human life should be. 'To the greater glory of God,' *A M D.G.*, that 'everything else, all that there is in the world, has been created for the sake of man, to help him to attain the end of his creation: the consequence is that man's duty is to use it or refrain from it according as it can lead us to our end or prevent us from attaining it.'

His conclusion is a state of *indifference* in regard to created things, which is not the same thing as *insensibility*, but absolute submission of the will to the designs of Providence in respect of each of us.

The *Exercises* proceed next to a thoughtful consideration of the great Christian truths and show their startling conformity with what we have realized through consideration of the '*foundation*' The meditations are divided, as in the *Exercitatorio* of Cisneros, into four weeks—not, however, in the same order. The object of the first week is to show us the evil of sin, to make us plumb the depths of the Hell to which it leads, and to prepare us for a fervent confession which will purge our souls of the foul stains which sin has left. The second week makes the call of Christ, the King of our hearts, ring in the ears of the man who has been cleansed of sin, waves before him His glorious banner, displays the picture of the titanic struggle which occupies all human history, the struggle for or against God—St. Augustine's two cities—and invites the neophyte to choose his camp and his battle station. Then is the time for him to make his *election*. The third week is intended to confirm the resolution made after the contemplation of the mysteries of the life of our Saviour, and more especially of His Passion, in which He displayed such touching love for us. Lastly the fourth week, by dwelling on the glorious mysteries, leads us to the threshold of the life of union with Christ through the final contemplation of the *divine love*.

The *Exercises* took final shape in the mind of St. Ignatius at Manresa towards the end of 1522, the same time that Luther had left the Wartburg and was feeling his way towards the organization of a State Church. Ignatius was to perfect them later by annotations and additional rules showing the riches of his personal experience. The thought of keeping to himself the treasures he had received from above never occurred to him for a moment. The *Exercises* from the beginning were a most effective means ready to his hand of winning souls to God, although he had no notion yet of the part he was destined to play in the Church.

He remained for about a year at Manresa and thence made a pilgrimage to Palestine, stopping on his way at Rome, where he received the blessing of Pope Adrian VI. He arrived in Jerusalem in September 1523, venerated the Holy Places sanctified by the memory of our Saviour, and returned to Barcelona with the vague intention of settling in some cloister, but still without fixing himself definitely anywhere. One thing only was clear to his mind he wanted *to serve God*.

Service for him was a family tradition; he was the scion of a knightly race. But he did not yet know how he could achieve for God what he dreamed in his youth of doing 'for some princess'. While he was on the boat returning from the Holy Land to Venice it occurred to him that he could not hope to influence the Christian world unless he first learnt to understand his religion. If he would serve God he must first learn to use the noblest gift which God had given him, his reason. So with native energy and habitual contempt for human conventions, though over thirty years of age, he went and sat himself on a bench with school children in order to learn the rudiments of Latin (1524-6). From Barcelona he went for higher studies to the university of Alcala, and thence to Salamanca. At Barcelona and Alcala, he gathered a few disciples and put them through the *Exercises* which had been sketched out at Manresa and were then for the first time probably reduced to writing. His followers were filled with enthusiasm for his method. His reputation increased. But he was denounced to the Inquisition as a suspicious enthusiast and thrown into prison. He spent forty-two days in a cell in Alcala, twenty-two days in confinement at Salamanca. He himself tells us that he gave the *Exercises* to people who came to visit him in prison.¹ Nothing could trouble him. He refused to seek the help of a legal advocate. His judges were doubtful about the orthodoxy of certain points in his *Exercises*, and he told them with a shade of bluntness far removed from the coarse obstinacy of Luther: 'It is for you to decide whether it be truth, yes or no. And if it is not the truth, condemn it.'²

¹ *Autobiography, or Book of the Pilgrims*, No 60

² *Ibid.*, No 68

The tribunals in the end admitted his complete innocence. He left Spain early in 1528 to continue his studies in the Sorbonne, which had not yet lost its ancient reputation. He arrived in Paris on the 2nd February and entered his name on the roll of the Collège de Montaigu, just as a youth of the name of Calvin, then aged nineteen, was leaving.

Ignatius remained in Paris for seven years, taking the whole course of philosophical and theological studies and all the time continuing to give the *Exercises* to those with whom he came in contact. Even surrounded by the undergraduates of Paris University, in an atmosphere of turbulence and agitation, where life was swift and passionate and Erasmians and Lutherans, not always open and avowed, abounded, the humble Ignatius, whom his years kept somewhat at a distance from frivolous or ambitious youth, found the means of making conversions. But the Paris Inquisition also took fright. An inquiry was held and the complete orthodoxy of the Spanish student acknowledged.

We learn from the *Book of the Pilgrim* that as early as 1528 he had given the *Exercises* to three friends in retreat so that 'their lives became noticeably changed'.¹ Through the *Exercises* he won over Pierre Le Fèvre, a studious Savoyard of placid disposition and fervent piety, then the ardent Navarrese Francis Xavier, a fellow Basque, whom he lured away from the mundane ambitions which occupied his active mind. Two other Spanish students, Diego Laynez and Alfonso Salmeron, followed their compatriot's example. Next came a Portuguese, Simon Rodriguez, and after him another Spaniard, Nicholas Bobadilla.

The little company, including Ignatius, now numbered seven. On the 15th August 1534, the Feast of the Assumption, they took a solemn step. They climbed the hill to Montmartre, and in the Benedictine Chapel of St. Denis consecrated themselves to the service of God. But the Order destined to grow from such humble beginnings was not yet founded. They had made a vow of poverty and chastity but no vow of obedience. They had no thought of engaging in the struggle against Protestantism or even of playing any part of great importance in the Church.

¹ Ibid., No. 77

Pierre Le Fèvre, the only member of the little band who was a priest, said Mass, and in the course of the Holy Sacrifice they all pledged themselves before the consecrated Host to repair to Jerusalem and devote themselves to the salvation of souls in infidel countries. But faithful to the principles laid down by Ignatius, they resolved to pay attention only to whatever indications might be granted them of the divine will.

In the next two years they celebrated the anniversary of their consecration with fervour. They had gathered recruits Claude Le Jay, a Savoyard, and two Frenchmen, Pascal Broet and Jean Codure. Ignatius had left Paris and gone to Spain, whence he made his way to Venice. The ten companions set out to rejoin him and in 1536 reached Venice, prepared to set sail for Jerusalem in accordance with their vow. They made their way from Paris on foot, rosaries round their necks, their breviaries, college note-books and Bibles—for they, too, were devoted to the Bible—hanging in leather satchels on their backs. Owing to the disturbed political conditions in the eastern Mediterranean there was no ship sailing. They thought then of travelling on to Rome. Ignatius, trembling for the future of his enterprise, did not accompany them. The influential Caraffa and another exalted personage of the name of Ortiz, Imperial plenipotentiary at the court of Rome, to whom as a teacher in the university of Paris he had given offence, must, he thought, be unfavourably disposed to them. Great was the surprise of the poor Paris graduates when they found Ortiz himself recommending them to the Supreme Pontiff, Paul III. The Pope insisted upon hearing them, made them debate before him, while he sat at dinner, with learned Roman theologians, and marvelled at the learning they displayed and their profound humility. Caraffa also was conquered. On their return to Venice, they brought back with them, besides precious encouragement, a special authorization from the Pope for Ignatius, Francis Xavier, and five others of the little band to be ordained priests.

Owing to the continuance of the political disturbances the whole year passed without a single ship sailing for the Holy Places, they therefore considered themselves no longer bound

by their vow and placed themselves at the disposal of the Holy See. They then gave a name to their company and called themselves the *Society of Jesus*.¹ The populace called them 'Inigists' from the name of Ignatius, and a little later on, about 1544, in lower Germany, they were talked of as *Jesuits*,² a form of appellation which the members of the Society accepted only with reluctance

Warmly welcomed by the Pope, the new 'reformed priests', as they were sometimes called, encountered considerable opposition in the Curia and from local custom. The Roman populace was scandalized to see men wearing no religious habit of an Order, preaching in and out of season—not merely in Advent and Lent—eagerly exhorting the faithful to frequent the sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion and combating above all the fear of popular opinion, of 'what people would say'. Opinions naturally differed in their regard. They were from the beginning and have since continued to be 'an object of contradiction'. They were assailed with calumnies, insults, and accusations of every kind. They endured them all with patience.

Ignatius had celebrated his first Mass on Christmas Day, 1538, in Sta Maria Maggiore. The winter that year was extremely severe. The comrades became beggars to provide the poor with food and clothing.

The idea of the Institute which was still floating in their minds at last began to take shape. They decided in 1539 to elect a

¹ The full style is *Clerks Regular of the Society of Jesus*, that is to say, priests living in community under a rule but not bound to say the office regularly in chou a dispensation which ensured mobility (In the original notes of Ignatius in Spanish the name was *Compañía de Jesus*, a possible allusion to the 'Companies' formed by adventurous leaders and Saxon princes and cities. In the Latin *Compañía* became *Societas*). Paul IV (Caraffa) later (1558) would have obliged them to do so and to elect their general for three years only, not for life Cf the Appendix to the Roman edition of the *Rules* published in December 1558. Paul IV died on the 18th August 1559, and his successor Pius IV (Giovanni Angelo de' Medici), not a Neapolitan and therefore not naturally hostile to anything Spanish, fortunately revoked his predecessor's orders as far as was necessary

² The nickname is older than the foundation of the Society, and according to Pastori, vol. xii, p. 25, note 5, was in current use in the fifteenth century for a 'pious Christian, sometimes a Mendicant brother', i.e. one presumably with the Holy Name always on his lips in a canting, exaggerated, and hypocritical fashion. It makes its first appearance in English in 1559 in the *Cecil Papers*, i. 153, in reference to 'Jesuits and other seminarians secretly come into the realm' Cf the O E D , s.v.

Superior and to make their vow of obedience to him. At last a new Order had indeed come into being. Ignatius drew up the scheme of a Constitution. The *Spiritual Exercises* had worked wonders even in the Sacred College. Cardinal Contarini had performed them and expressed a desire to transcribe the Ignatian text with his own hand. He undertook to present the Constitution of the new Order to the Pope.

Various witnesses relate that after reading the five chapters of the Rule, Paul III exclaimed 'The finger of God is here . We bless it, we commend it, we approve it' The confirmatory Bull (*Regimini militantis ecclesiae*) was not issued until the 27th September 1540. It consecrated the title of the Society of Jesus as eminently suitable to an institution whose members were devoted 'to fight for God beneath the banner of the Cross'.

To the three ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience a fourth was added, binding the members of the Society in a special manner to the Supreme Pontiff. In virtue of this vow, said the Constitution, 'we bind ourselves in everything concerning the salvation of souls and the propagation of the faith to carry out, as far as lies within our power, every order imposed upon us by the present Pope and his successors without delay or evasion, whether they dispatch us to the Turks or other infidels or even to the countries called the Indies, or among heretics or schismatics, or, if need be, among the faithful.'

The number of members of the new Society was at first to be limited, however, to sixty. Ignatius was unanimously elected General by his nine companions on the 7th April 1541. he refused the honour at first, but yielded on the 17th, and five days later received the first vows of his brethren in a chapel of St Paul outside the walls. Thenceforward the progress of the Society was rapid. A second Bull (*Injunctum nobis*) was obtained from Paul III on the 15th March 1543, and the clause restricting the number of associates to sixty was abolished. In June 1545 a Brief authorized the Jesuits to preach, to hear confessions, and to administer the Sacraments, without first obtaining permission from the Ordinary or parish priests, wherever they might be exercising their ministry.

The Holy See realized what a magnificent instrument of reform Providence had made ready to its hand. It exercised on behalf of the Society the primacy of jurisdiction that it had received from Jesus Christ in the person of St Peter but which religious nationalism was more and more bitterly contesting.

5 ST ANGELA MERICI AND THE URSULINES

While the illustrious Society of Jesus was being formed to play such a remarkable part in the reform of the Catholic Church by preaching, by the education of youth in numerous flourishing colleges and universities, by the direction of consciences and the publication of innumerable treatises in every branch of ecclesiastical learning, another association, no less important, perhaps, although hidden from the eyes of the world, and not concerned with the struggles and controversies of the time, was being founded for the education of girls. The Congregation of Ursuline Sisters achieved for women in the sphere of education what the Jesuits had done for men. If it be true that the mother's influence upon her children is the more profound in proportion as she is the first to influence their minds, the creation of an Institution specially intended for the Christian training of future mothers must be regarded as an event of the highest importance in the work of Catholic reform.

Angela Merici was born at Desenzano on the shores of the Lake of Garda, on the 21st March 1471, and was left an orphan at an early age. The sudden death of a dearly loved sister overwhelmed her with grief, and she sought consolation in the fervour of true devotion. She became a member of the Third Order of St Francis and gathered young girls around her to take part in the various works of beneficence which occupied her life. Heaven, one day, seemed to open before her and, as she was praying, she had a vision and realized that she would found an association devoted to charitable work. She thereupon began to collect the little girl foundlings of her native village, to impart to them the elements of religious instruction and the rudiments of education. This was some years before the revolt of Luther.

Early in 1516 Angela came to Brescia and there pursued the same course of activity. Ignatius Loyola had made the pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1523, Angela went in 1524—so powerful was the influence still exercised over devout souls in Christendom by the Sepulchre of our Lord. In 1525 Angela travelled to Rome for the Jubilee and was presented to Pope Clement VII, who would have gladly retained her in the Eternal City, as a suitable field for the exercise of her talents in the education of youth. She returned, however, to Brescia, and after many interruptions due to wars and public calamities founded there a religious establishment ‘for the exercise of Christian charity by the care of the sick and the education of youth and the sanctification of souls’. She placed the nascent congregation, which first appeared in the guise of a simple confraternity, under the patronage of St. Ursula, whence her Sisters took their names. They were in the beginning to remain in their parents’ houses, to meet every day to hear Mass and say certain prayers and perform their self-appointed tasks. They were not to wear any distinctive dress or take any special vows. Their Rule was dictated by Angela Merici to a priest, Gabriel Cozzano, and received the approval of Cardinal Cornaro, bishop of Brescia, in the month of August 1536. A Bull of Paul III, dated the 9th June 1544, confirmed ‘the association of maidens established at Brescia under the patronage of St Ursula’ and permitted the Superior of the Confraternity to suggest to the Holy See such modifications of the primitive rule as they should consider desirable. Such was the origin of a development destined to transform the simple association founded by St. Angela (she was formally canonized in 1807) into an Order properly so called.

St Charles Borromeo later welcomed the Ursulines to his diocese of Milan, gave them a communal life under one roof, and imposed on them simple vows (1568). They passed into France, about 1612, and there obtained the privilege of taking solemn vows and keeping enclosure.¹

¹ The first Catholic convent in Scotland since the Reformation was founded by them in Edinburgh, in 1836.

SOURCES

The Works of St Ignatius, his *Spiritual Exercises* first and foremost, his *Correspondence* (*Cartas de San Ignacio de Loyola*, 6 vols., Madrid, 1874-89) All the relevant documents concerning the saint and the foundation of the Society are to be found in the vast collection in course of publication, since 1903, in Madrid, under the title of *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*. St Ignatius told the story of his life to Padre Gonsalvez de Camara, who published his account in an *Autobiography*, or *Book of the Pilgrim*. Cf also the Bollandist *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. vii, for the month of July, first published at Antwerp in 1731. One of the best of the earlier lives is that by Daniele Bartoli, S.J., in classical Italian, Rome, 1650, which has been frequently translated into various languages.

CHAPTER II

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

Summary 1 The origins of the Council 2 Luther's attitude to the Council Death of the Reformer 3 Brief history of the Council of Trent 4 The doctrine of the Council of Trent as opposed to Protestant systems

I THE ORIGINS OF THE COUNCIL

LUTHER himself had been the first to raise the question of a Council by publishing on the 28th November 1518 his *Appeal from the Pope to the Council*, and 'Appeal' had become a sort of shibboleth among the Lutherans. Everybody at Worms, according to Alexander, clamoured for a Council. But by that time (1521) Luther's partisans imposed as a condition of the summoning of a Council that it should meet in Germany. The estates assembled at the Diet of Nuremberg desired that the Pope, in agreement with the Emperor, should convoke a 'free Christian Council' at Strasbourg or Mainz, Cologne, Metz, or any other German town (5th February 1523), and the meaning they attached to the phrase 'free Council' is easily gathered from the explanations given later by Luther in person. The intention was plainly to oppose the authority of a Council to the Pope.

Luther had come to the conclusion that the convocation of such a Council was a matter for the Emperor and the Christian princes alone. This was the thesis he maintained with his accustomed violence in his *Appeal to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*. He urged that it was inadvisable that the Pope should be called upon to act as convener of a 'free' Council. If he were it would look like an admission of the generally held belief that a Council could not be lawful unless formally convoked by pontifical authority. Luther argued as though it were simply in the nature of things that the Germans should take over the control of the Church and oust the Italians. The Diet of Nuremberg did not venture openly to accept the whole of his thesis, and realized that a Council would only be considered universal on condition that the Pope, the representative of

unity in the Church, gave it the support of his expressed approval

Pope Adrian VI (Adrian Dedel of Utrecht, bishop of Tortosa)—the last non-Italian Pope—was not the man to shirk the difficulties involved in the convocation of a Council, but he died on the 14th September 1523, too soon to realize his ambitious schemes of religious reform

Clement VII (Giulio de' Medici) inherited his predecessor's desire to heal the wounds from which the Church was suffering but neither his energy nor his clarity of vision. His legate, Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, combated at the Diet of Nuremberg in 1524 the fallacious proposals put forward by Luther's partisans for a German national Council, but agreed that an oecumenical Council should be held. The Pope did not fail to support his legate,¹ but doubtless exaggerated the difficulties in the way. The political situation was full of menace. The rivalry between France and the house of Austria, the danger of the Turkish invasion, the attitude of the German princes and of Sweden, all seemed to him so many factors adverse to the assembly of a General Council. He would have preferred a sort of congress of theologians nominated by the princes of all countries, what might be described as an *Assembly of Notables*, to take counsel on the means of curing the disorders afflicting the Church.² Charles V recommended the summoning of a Council at Trent, a town on the main road from Germany into Italy and as German as it was Italian. Twenty years were still to elapse before the project was realized. Pope Clement VII allowed himself to be embroiled in the mêlée of political conflicts. He sided with Francis I against Charles V. The sack of Rome and its attendant horrors were the result. When peace was once more restored between him and the Emperor by the Treaty of Barcelona (29th June 1529) the proposal for a Council was taken up again, but with scanty enthusiasm, only to encounter fresh difficulties raised by Francis I.³ A detailed narrative of the course of events would be long and tedious, but, to

¹ Cf *Concilium Trident*, vol iv, p xix, of the *Introductio* by S Ehses

² Ibid., p xx

³ Cf op cit., pp lxiv et seq

put the matter briefly, the progress of the movement for official reform was at one time hindered by the Supreme Pontiff's own lack of initiative, at another by opposition from princes or political obstacles, until at last the dogged tenacity of Pope Paul III, the successor of Clement VII, finally triumphed in 1545.

Paul III (Alessandro Farnese) was not only a prudent diplomat but a persevering, far-seeing statesman: in spite of the reproaches which might be suggested by his conduct as a young man (he had been given the purple by Alexander VI in 1493 at the age of twenty-five), as a Pope he strove sincerely for the right. It was owing to his patronage that the attempts at 'spontaneous reform' were encouraged and fruitfully developed. He deserves the credit of realizing the immensity of the task before him and doing all that was possible to accomplish it. If some of the appointments he made to the Sacred College were marred by nepotism, most of the others showed his clearness of vision and his desire to come to the help of the Christian world.

On his accession to the pontifical throne, in 1534, he raised to the purple men like Caraffa, Casparo, Contarini, and Sadoleto, and established with their assistance a Commission of Reform which after extensive preliminary labours in preparation for the eventual Council published (or, rather, indiscreetly suffered to be published) in 1537 a *Consilium delectorum Cardinalium et aliorum praelatorum de emendanda ecclesia*, which Luther lost no time in turning into ridicule, but which contained in embryo a complete scheme for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline.¹ The grave abuses afflicting the Church were denounced: the ordination of badly educated priests, the appointment of unworthy bishops, the accumulation of benefices (pluralism), reservations, and 'expectatives' (reversions), the decline of some of the religious orders, the low level to which preaching and the

¹ The text is published by F. Dittrich in *Briefe und Regesten* at pp. 279-88, by Ehses in *Romische Quartalschrift*, xiv, pp. 102 et seq., and also in Kidd's *Documents, &c.*, at p. 307. The other six members of the Commission were Giberti, Aleander, Federigo Fregoso, Gregorio Cortese, Tommaso Badia, the Master of the Sacred Palace, and Reginald Pole.

direction of souls in the confessional had sunk, the indifference to moral influences in colleges intended for the education of youth as instanced by the use of such dangerous school books as the *Colloquia* of Erasmus which nearly everywhere had become a classic—and so forth.

Amongst the most interesting documents, in this far-ranging inquiry in preparation for the Council, which Paul III instituted, is the '*Advice*' sent by Zwingli's old opponent Johann Faber, a former vicar-general of Constance, later an Aulic Counsellor, and, since 1530, bishop of Vienna. Faber knew the situation in the German lands as well as any man. He had frequented Erasmian circles in his youth and as a priest had vigorously combated the new doctrines, at one time personally attacking the enemies of the Catholic Faith in 'Disputations' organized by them, at another challenging them in 'Disputations' organized by himself and his friends. His '*Advice*', entitled *Praeparatoria futuri universalis . . . Concilii*¹ and dated 6th July 1536, insisted above all on the necessity of fighting Luther and his partisans on their own ground, the Scriptures. 'Scholastic theology', Faber wrote, 'has little or no weight with the Lutherans. It is therefore essential that those who wish to refute them should be Biblical scholars soundly trained in Holy Writ.'²

Paul III valued highly the counsel he invited from every recognized authority within the Church, and it is possible that the delays which hindered the meeting of the Council—deplorable as they seemed at the time—were in the end most fortunate for the efficacy of the measures adopted when at last it met.

The Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17) had been concluded shortly before the outbreak of the Lutheran revolution—the final session was held on the 16th March 1517—and many prudent measures of reform had been passed without anybody paying the slightest attention to them. Without the reforming efforts of the religious Orders already described, without the particular Councils such as those held in 1528 at Sens and

¹ Reproduced by Ehses in *Concilium Trident.* iv 10 et seq

² *Ibid.*, No 27, p 13

Bourges in France, without the innumerable attempts made by the bishops of the League of Ratisbon in 1524, on the one hand, and by zealous Churchmen such as Giberti, bishop of Verona, and the influential cardinals surrounding Paul III, on the other, and without the thunderbolt of the sack of Rome in 1527 and the public calamities which it portended,—without such a preparation of events and the gradual change in men's minds, possibly either the work of the Council of Trent would not have been what it was, or, at least—which would have been worse—it would have had little effect in the Church. Speeches and decrees are of no avail without the goodwill of men. The Council set to work in an atmosphere which had been already profoundly changed. This was the best guarantee of its success

2. LUTHER'S ATTITUDE TO THE COUNCIL. DEATH OF THE REFORMER (18th February 1546).

The tone of Luther's writings about the Council form a striking contrast to that of the documents proceeding from those who co-operated with Paul III. They are characterized by a violence and coarse vulgarity which make the most painful impression upon the impartial reader.

The bare idea of a Council convoked by the Pope was enough to raise his wrath. Every attempt made by the Holy See to induce the Protestants to compare their doctrines before a General Council with those traditionally held by the Church was met by the dogged and intractable opposition of Luther. The Reformer had published early in 1539 a tract entitled *Of Councils and Churches*, which he had begun in 1536 and concerning which he himself wrote to Melanchthon: 'I have finished my work on the Church. it is a book which bores me to an astonishing degree. I find it so feeble and verbose.'¹

Some years later, when the patient, persevering efforts of Paul III had at last brought the Council within the bounds of possibility, a further crisis arose. The Pope protested energetically in a Brief dated the 24th August 1544 against the impossible

¹ Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel*, XII. 115 (14th March 1539).

concessions made to the Protestant party by the Emperor at the Diet of Speyer without reference to the Holy See. The Brief was broadcast throughout Germany in two different drafts, probably by agents interested in disturbing the good relations existing between Paul III and Charles V.¹ Historians have, therefore, hitherto referred to two Briefs. Two Briefs were, in fact, sent to Luther, and from both sides came urgent exhortations to answer. The Chancellor Bruck, on the one hand, besought him in the name of the elector of Saxony 'to draw up something in defence of his cause against the Pope's memorial'² from the Imperial Chancellery, on the other hand, news came to him, through devious ways, which he was to use to his advantage against the Pope. The Emperor's entourage was, in fact, incensed at seeing the policy of concessions then dominant at court thwarted by the resolution of the Pope, who energetically cited precedents to prove that nothing valid could be effected, where religion was concerned, without the consent of the successor of Peter.

Luther felt no need of a spur. Feeling himself protected on both sides at once, he took the bit between his teeth, and giving full rein to the violence of his temper, published on the 26th March 1545 one of his most virulent tracts, entitled *Against the Papacy founded in Rome by the devil*. The work was written in German, as though the Reformer was desirous of giving the man in the street a complete and final statement of the fallacies in the claims of the Catholic Church.

If religious polemics have so often assumed such a grossly unchristian aspect and found expression in a style at once so cheap and vulgar, the fact is largely attributable to writings of this sort. Such a method of defending one's own opinion and attacking one's neighbour's cannot be sufficiently deplored and reprehended. Justus Jonas, apprehensive, no doubt, that foreigners might be unable to enjoy Luther's masterpiece, made haste to translate it into Latin, the international language of the day.

¹ Such is the opinion of Ehses, cf. *Conc. Trid.* iv. 374.

² *Corp. Reform.* v. 655

Although he was now in his sixtieth year, yet the passage of time had not taught the Reformer wisdom. He had been at death's door several times. The thought must have occurred to him that before long he would appear before the common Judge of all men. And yet the old man expressed himself in the following terms in the literary testament he bequeathed to his disciples:

For twenty-four years this cry has gone up in Germany 'We will have a free Christian Council in a German land'; but the three words free, Christian, German are poison, death, the devil and Hell to the Pope and the Court of Rome. The Pope cannot stomach them, bear the sight of them, or listen to them . . . The school of rascals in Rome and the Head Master of that school pervert and falsify the word 'free' in the sense that he alone and his school of rascals are to be free and no man is to dare to contradict them, to alter or anticipate their decisions, but everything they do is approved and confirmed, so that it is not the Council which will be free as against the Pope but the Pope against the Council . . . So has he perverted the word 'Christian' in such wise that all it now stands for is Papist and whatever His Hellishness and his school of rascals (May God forgive me! I had almost said 'his holy Church') judge and decide in Rome . . . And so the Emperor will have to burn, assassinate, or banish all heretics who are in agreement with God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. And why? Because God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost and his holy Church are all heretics and not Christians. And it is better for God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost and his holy Church to be condemned as the most infamous of heretics than for the Most Hellish Father Pope and his hermaphrodites to be called non-Christians.

If Luther admitted that his tract of 1539 was 'feeble and verbose', one would hesitate to describe the work under consideration by these two epithets. There are about one hundred and thirty pages expressed in the same violent style, and it would be difficult to be more ponderous or tedious, or to indulge in more irreverent scurrility than disfigures page after page of this ranting tirade. He ended thus:

'Here I must stop. With God's help, I will do better in another book. If I come to die before, may God grant that it be done by

another with a thousand times more violence. For the devilish Papistry is the greatest scourge on the earth, a more formidable danger than all the devils could have conceived with all their art God help us! Amen'

Eleven months later Luther was dead. He had referred so many times in such abominable terms to the deaths of his opponents that it is not surprising to find his own surrounded with legends reflecting little credit on his memory. The rumour was long current that he had committed suicide in a fit of despair. Bozius and Sedulius, in the sixteenth century, repeated the baseless fiction. It would appear that the Reformer, who was not very careful of his health or disposed to practise a rigid austerity in regard to the pleasures of the table, simply succumbed to an attack of apoplexy. Such at any rate is the account given by Landau, a Catholic apothecary, who was called in to attend him on his death-bed. It was on the 18th February 1546. Jonas and Coelius relate that a few moments before the end they shouted into Luther's ear 'Reverend Father, is it your wish to remain faithful to Christ and the doctrine you have preached?' 'Yes', the dying man replied. The word was very distinctly heard and it was his last.¹

History stands in perplexity before this strange figure, typical of one of the most agitated centuries mankind has ever experienced. One thing is certain. Luther does not bear the stamp of universality by which the great champions of truth are recognized in the world. He represents a period of time and a race. He was a German—and German Protestants proudly declare that he was *kerndeutsch*, 'German to the core'. He played a great part in his own time. He raised the standard of revolt, but soon found rival leaders dividing the forces he had called to action. The special form he gave to his teaching belonged only to his time. It was soon to be modified and varied even by those who still gave his name to the doctrines they taught. The teaching of Luther is repudiated even by Lutherans. But the teaching of the Council of Trent still lives in millions of believing hearts wherever the Faith of Christendom is professed.

¹ Cf N. Paulus, *Luther's Lebensende*.

3 BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

The history of the Council may be divided into three periods
 (a) under Paul III, from 1545 to 1549, (b) under Julius III,
 from 1551 to 1552; and (c) after a long interval, under Pius IV,
 from 1562 to 1563

The Council was solemnly opened on the 13th December, the third Sunday of Advent, 1545, by three Papal legates, Giovanni Maria del Monte (the future Pope Julius III), Marcello Cervini, cardinal of Santa Croce (the future Pope Marcellus II), and Reginald Pole, 'Cardinal of England', the son of Margaret Plantagenet, countess of Salisbury¹.

There was but a sparse attendance—one other cardinal, Madruzzo, bishop of Trent, four archbishops,² twenty-one bishops, five generals of Orders, forty-two theologians, nine doctors of law. The necessary arrangements were first made to regulate the business of the Council, and it was agreed that the subjects for discussion proposed by the Legates should be submitted to a *particular congregation*—a committee we should say nowadays—of theologians and canonists for their consideration. They would then be taken before a *general congregation* composed of bishops, the proctors of absent bishops, and the representatives of Catholic sovereigns, and decided in the last resort by a vote of the fathers assembled in solemn session. The right of voting was confined to bishops alone—the claims of absent bishops to vote by their proctors was rejected. Generals of Orders were also allowed one vote as representative of their Order: but abbots were restricted to one vote for every three abbots. Tommaso Campeggio, bishop of Feltre and a brother of the Cardinal Lorenzo, observed that it was difficult to decide whether the false teaching had brought about the dissolution of morals or the dissolution of morals had led to errors in doctrine and proposed that dogma and discipline, doctrine and reform, should be treated together. His suggestion was adopted.

¹ The daughter of the duke of Clarence and niece of Edward IV, condemned without trial under Henry VIII in 1539, she was beheaded in the Tower of London on the 28th May 1541, at the age of eighty.

² Including Robert Wauchope, archbishop of Armagh.

The task which lay before the Council was enormous. The Protestant heresy had already assumed so many different aspects and raised such an immense variety of problems that the terms of reference were nothing less than the general assertion of sound Catholic doctrine, the restoration of discipline, and the reorganization of the Church's forces to meet the dangers of the day.

After dallying over the preliminary arrangements so as to give the belated prelates an opportunity of arriving in time, the question of the 'Sources of Revelation' was discussed at the Fourth Session. As far as Scripture was concerned—and Scripture was the keystone of the position taken up by the enemies of the Church—the theologians had to consider the following problems. Are all the books of both Testaments to be accepted alike and considered as canonical? Should they be subjected to a fresh examination? Can they be divided into books of faith and books whose purpose is merely edification? Seripando was the only one to give an affirmative answer on the last point. After a minute investigation of the different aspects of the question, the decree on the Canonical Scriptures was solemnly published on the 8th April 1546. The Canon of the Sacred Books was settled according to the Council of Florence, and anathema was decreed against any person refusing to admit the canonicity of the Scriptures in every part preserved in the version of St. Jerome termed the Vulgate. Side by side with the Scriptures tradition, defined as *traditio Christi* and *traditio Apostolorum* (*Spiritu Sancto dictante*), was declared to be an authentic source of revelation in matters of faith and morals. The exclusive right of the Catholic Church to be the official exponent of Scripture was energetically reasserted.

The number of bishops present had gradually increased. The Fifth Session, which dealt with Original Sin, was attended by the four cardinals and fifty-eight archbishops or bishops. Laynez and Salmeron, the learned Jesuit theologians, led the debate which was closed in solemn session on the 17th June 1546.

The Sixth Session was distinguished by discussions which were at one time prolix and at another impassioned. The subject,

Justification, was of burning actuality for the men of the day. The Emperor's representatives, considering only the political situation, would willingly have eschewed any dogmatic definition, because, as might have been expected, the inevitable condemnation of Protestant doctrines on such a subject was bound to make the breach irreparable. But it was nursing an illusion to believe that silence on such an important matter could have any other result than simply to distress the minds of such as still adhered to the traditional faith. The Pope brushed aside all opposition. The far-reaching, delicate problem of *Justification* was scrupulously considered in forty-four particular and sixty-one general congregations. The draft decree drawn up by the learned Cardinals Cervini and Seripando was revised and redrawn with particular care, finally settled and approved on the 13th January 1547. The Seventh Session closed on the 3rd March 1547 with a decree on the Sacraments. The conflict between the Pope and the Emperor then became exasperated to the last degree. The Schmalkaldic war had broken out on the 29th July 1546. His victory at Muhlberg on the Elbe (24th April 1547) had made Charles V master of the situation in Germany. He reverted to his policy of *Interims* (temporary measures of compromise), which his advisers considered astute. He was angry with the legates for seizing the opportunity of a short-lived epidemic at Trent to transfer the Council to Bologna in spite of the protests raised by the bishops who were devoted to his cause. The Pope decided to adjourn the Council formally on the 17th September 1549, and on the 10th November following he died. His successor Julius III was the Cardinal Giovanni Maria del Monte who had presided over the Council in Trent and Bologna.

The new Pope's dearest ambition was to reopen the Council. He succeeded in November 1550, but it was found impossible to resume work until the following year. The question of the Blessed Sacrament, which had been under discussion, was taken up again and the conclusions arrived at were promulgated in the important decrees of the Thirteenth Session, published on the 11th October 1551. The Fourteenth Session dealt with the

Sacrament of Penance (25th November 1551). It was then decided to interrupt the labours of the Council, in the fallacious hope of settlement with the Protestants. The disappearance of Luther, whose place as leader of those who accepted the Augsburg Confession was taken by the more moderate Melanchthon, and the intervention of various political factors had induced the Protestant princes to agitate for a suspension of the Council's deliberations until their theologians arrived. Melanchthon even started off. But the attitude of the first Protestants to arrive at the Council, the demands they made, the rumours of war breaking out again (the second Schmalkaldic war) effectively checked the movement towards an understanding, and on the 28th April 1552, the Council was once more adjourned.

Julius III died on the 25th March 1555, and his successor Marcellus II, Cardinal Marcello Cervini, survived his election only three weeks, to be succeeded in turn by Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, Paul IV, who had too much confidence in his own reforming zeal and too great an antipathy to the Habsburgs to resume the work of the Council. Ten years were to elapse, until the Pontificate of Pius IV, Giovanni Angelo de' Medici (a Milanese, and quite unconnected with the famous Florentine family), before work was begun again. The power of the Protestants had increased to such an extent as a result of the advantages accorded to them by the Peace of Augsburg in September 1555 that the German bishops were intimidated and did not dare show themselves at Trent, where the Council had been reopened. The new Emperor—Ferdinand I, the brother of Charles V—finally opposed any dogmatic decision. The policy of 'Colloquies' and making concessions to the Protestants still predominated at the Imperial Court. Ferdinand was convinced that to allow communion in both kinds and the marriage of priests would be the means of winning them back to the Catholic Church or at any rate checking the progress of the heresy. The fathers were content at first simply to promulgate disciplinary decrees: it was decided to revise the Index of Prohibited Books issued by Paul IV, to regulate the ritual of Holy Communion and ordinations, to control mendicants and

the preachers of Indulgences The consideration of doctrinal questions was, however, resumed and decrees published in the Twenty-Second Session on the 17th September 1562 They dealt with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the granting of the chalice to the laity

The Twenty-Third Session, which resumed the discussion of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, was specially important The vital question of the education of the clergy was then (15th July 1563) settled and the establishment of seminaries decreed. It has been said—and rightly—that, if the Council had achieved nothing else, this decision alone would have been its sufficient justification The benefits which accrued from the foundation of seminaries are incalculable The Catholic Reform was thereby enabled to endure, to increase in intensity, and to develop as time went on The education of the clergy in seminaries is to the impartial observer an essential safeguard of the Catholic religion and the condition determining its future in the world

The Twenty-Fourth Session, on the 11th November 1563, dealt with the subject of Christian marriage, and the Twenty-Fifth (December, 1563) discussed Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and the veneration of relics. A rumour that the Pope was dying brought the Council to a hasty end. The Twenty-Fifth and final session was closed on the 4th December 1563 by Cardinal Giovanni Morone, bishop of Modena Its decrees were signed by the two hundred and fifty-two members assembled, six cardinals, the four legates, Cardinal Madruzzo and the cardinal of Lorraine, three patriarchs, one hundred and ninety-two archbishops and bishops, seven abbots, seven generals of Orders, and absentees represented by their proctors

The decisions of the Council were immediately accepted in Portugal, Venice, the duchy of Savoy, and every Italian State The Legate Gian Francesco Commendone secured their adoption in Poland. Philip II, king of Spain, published them with the saving clause ‘without prejudice to the rights of the Crown’ The Emperor Maximilian I waited until 1566 before giving them the force of law in the German Empire, but the Catholic

princes had already seen to their application in their own States In France, where the Wars of Religion had just begun and Gallicanism was taking deep root, the Council encountered the opposition of the lawyers and the politicians The decrees were never officially enrolled in the Statute Book. But the bishops had from the beginning accepted the dogmatic findings and endeavoured gradually to enforce the disciplinary enactments. These, as has been said, had been drawn up simultaneously with the decisions regarding doctrine and affected every department of Christian and ecclesiastical life

A great task had been accomplished

Such [in the words of Ranke] was the successful issue of the Council, which, so urgently demanded, so long deferred, twice dissolved, shaken by so many political storms, and, even at its third convocation, beset with dangers, ended in the universal agreement of the Catholic world It is no wonder, that at the last meeting of the prelates on the 4th December 1563, they were full of emotion and gladness Even opponents wished each other joy tears were seen in many of those aged eyes These reforms are to this hour of the highest importance The faithful were again subjected to severe and uncompromising church discipline, and, in pressing cases, to the sword of excommunication Seminaries were founded, in which the young clergy were carefully educated in austere habits, and in the fear of God The parishes were regulated anew, strict rules laid down for the administration of the sacraments and for preaching, and the co-operation of the regular clergy governed by fixed laws. The duties of their office, especially the supervision of the clergy, were strongly impressed upon the bishops according to the several decrees of their consecration They also solemnly bound themselves by a peculiar profession of faith (which they subscribed, and to which they swore), to observe the decrees of the Council of Trent, and to render entire obedience to the Pope. A measure the consequences of which were most important

The object which was certainly contemplated by the first movers of a General Council of the Church, i e the limitation of the power of the Pope, was, however, not attained by it On the contrary, that power emerged from the struggle extended and enhanced As the Pontiff held the exclusive right of interpreting the decrees of Trent, it always rested with him to prescribe the rule of faith and

of life. The whole direction of the restored discipline was concentrated in Rome. [And the great Protestant historian rightly concludes] With new and collected strength Catholicism now advanced to the conflict with the Protestant world¹.

It was immediately realized on the Catholic side what happy consequences were bound to follow from the Council. To be convinced of this it is sufficient to re-read the closing address delivered before the Council on the 3rd December 1563 by Bishop Girolamo Ragazzoni.

Henceforth [said the prelate] ambition will no longer usurp the place of virtue in the sacred ministry. The word of God will be more frequently delivered and with greater care. Bishops will remain among their flocks². Henceforth those privileges which were a cloak for vice and error and greed are abolished, idle clergy are swept away. Sacred things will cease to be sold for money and we shall no longer be afflicted by the scandalous commerce of professional mendicants. Ministers bred from youth in the service of the Lord will be taught to worship Him in greater purity and more worthily. Provincial synods have been re-established and strict rules laid down for the granting of benefices and spiritual charges. Church property may no longer be devised as a family inheritance, excommunications are restricted within narrower bounds, a strong brake has been applied to the cupidity, the licence, and the luxury of clergy and laity alike, prudent warnings have been administered to kings and the potentates of the earth. Is all that not sufficient testimony to the high and holy things you have accomplished?

The speech, it will be observed, contains a sincere admission of past abuses at the same time as it gives a summary of the reforms enacted by the Council. There were no doubt many transgressions left for the future to deplore, but the predictions of the orator were on the whole realized.

It should be added that simultaneously with the disciplinary reforms emphasized in the address the dogmatic achievement of the Council was no less important. Against the fluctuating,

¹ Cf op cit, vol 1 at pp 238-40 and p 260 (Mrs Austin's translation)

² The vital decree insisting upon *Residence* as essential and empowering bishops to visit all the churches in their diocese, including the Cathedral Chapter, was published with a limiting prescription preserving the authority of the Holy See, at the Seventh Session on the 5th March 1547

changing doctrines of Protestantism it reaffirmed the majestic, intangible unity of Catholic dogma and supplied a solid foundation for further theological speculation

The more notable doctrinal decisions may be briefly considered.

4. THE DOCTRINE OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT AS OPPOSED TO PROTESTANT SYSTEMS

The doctrinal gulf between Catholicism and Protestantism was manifest from the outset in the condemnation of radical Biblicalism. Nothing is more sacred to a Catholic than the Word of God contained in the Scriptures. None opposes with more vigour and vigilance the encroachments of the self-styled 'critical' spirit upon the domain of the Sacred Books. But the Scriptures are not the exclusive sources of revelation. The Catholic sets side by side with them 'Apostolic tradition', which, in fact, preceded the Books of the New Testament and according to which the Books themselves were valued, sanctioned, and confirmed by the Apostolic Church. It may be truthfully said in a sense that these Books are merely that part of tradition which has been acknowledged to possess the character of divine inspiration.

The Church is the depository of these apostolic traditions and of the Bible itself, and to the Church alone belongs the right of interpreting officially and without fear of error all divine revelation. There must be some authority in the last resort to settle controversies concerning Holy Scripture. The Protestants argued The Holy Ghost settles such vexed questions by speaking to the heart of the faithful—in reality, an illusory answer. The Catholic does not attribute infallibility to a man or a human institution as such any more than the Protestant, but to the Holy Ghost who guarantees the inerrancy of the Church and her Head, the Pope, or, in the assembly of her leaders, the General Council. In fact, for the Lutherans Luther, and for the Calvinists Calvin, enjoyed the privilege of speaking in the name of the Holy Ghost.

Latent in the quarrel of words was the distressing preoc-

cupation Shall Germans or Italians be entrusted with the direction of souls? Are we to remain bowed beneath the yoke of a foreign Pope? Such questions of race and personality are of no account to any but a superficial observer. We can no longer argue like the Jews who said. 'Can anything of good come from Nazareth?'

Considering next the dogmas which established a line of demarcation between Catholics and Protestants, we at once encounter, in the Council of Trent, the dogma of Original Sin. Luther had made it his starting-point. Obsessed by the idea of a primitive fall, the only explanation, in his mind, of the interior discord, the appalling contradiction which we find within us between the flesh and the spirit, he had deformed by aggravation the traditional conception of original sin which had been elucidated at the time of the Pelagian controversy by the genius of St Augustine. Humanity appeared to him—he had found the expression in St. Augustine—as a 'dough of damnation', a pitiful herd of fallen creatures, degraded and utterly corrupt, incapable of good and committing mortal sins whatever they did. The taint, as he conceived it, affected the intellect, which was fatally condemned to error, the will, which thenceforward was inevitably inclined solely to evil, the heart, which became enamoured of the things of the world, hating the things of God. The taint according to him had penetrated so deeply that even the blood of the Redeemer is of no avail to wash it away in baptism. It remains and will remain until the consummation of the world. God, however, of His sheer goodness ordains the salvation of a few of mankind, while condemning the rest to Hell. In this work of salvation it is He who does everything. He evokes in the depths of souls wrapt in darkness and sunk in degradation the terrifying sense of sin and at the same time the saving sense of *faith* in the Redemption achieved by Christ. The Divine Spirit uses the Word to produce such sentiments, that is to say, the Bible, which reveals to us on the one hand the *Law*—and the *Law* drives us to despair—on the other hand the *Promise* of the gratuitous remission of our sins—and the *Promise* consoles, set us up again and justifies us.

One point in the theory is not quite clear. Luther maintains that it is impossible to fulfil the Law and that its function is solely to terrify us by the spectacle of our own impotence and culpability. And yet he declares that the justified fulfil the Law spontaneously and lovingly, seeing neither obligation to do so nor merit in so doing. There are two possible views. Either we are freed from the burden of the Law and discharged of any obligation in respect thereof by Christ, who covers us with His own merits and 'imputes' to us His own absolute and entire fulfilment of the Law, or we really acquire fresh energy to accomplish what before we were unable to do. It is certain that Luther took the former view and that Melanchthon, in writing to Brenz that St. Augustine did not fully realize the force of faith, intended to convey that the great doctor took the latter, which is also the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

In this contention the Church sees the fundamental error of Luther and his school. They have in fact created a new religion. If religion consists in the regulation of the relations between man and God, Luther has altered the religion of Christ. It is the greater or less degree of free will which makes all the difference. The crucial point dividing Luther and the Council of Trent is the following. In Luther's view God does everything, man contributes nothing, whereas Catholicism holds that man collaborates with the grace of God. For Luther faith is produced in us without our connivance, and whatever good we do is the work of God alone with no co-operation on our part, nor merit nor freedom, whereas for the Council the human will, excited and forestalled by divine grace, furnishes its free assistance at every step in the progress of the soul first towards justification and afterwards to ultimate salvation.

Here are two conflicting conceptions of religion. for Luther, the more you take away from the creature, the higher you exalt the Creator. The Catholic holds that the true grandeur of religion consists in the free gift which the creature makes of itself by faith, hope, and love to its Creator. Ignatius of Loyola said: 'I am created to *serve* God.' But there can be no question

of service if God is the author of all things in us. The Council of Trent rejected the conception of an original fall so absolute and complete as to make man cease to be man and to turn him into a monster by depriving his faculties of their natural power of adapting themselves to their last end. It attributed to Christ alone the great benefit of the Redemption, but taught that the Redemption was a reality and not merely apparent, as Luther maintained. Baptism does really efface the taint of original sin. The concupiscence remaining in the baptised deserves the name of sin only in the wide sense, inasmuch as it derives from sin and inclines us to sin. Free will is not extinguished in man. Man remains a moral creature. Only the strength of his freedom has been weakened and disorientated. The Council rejected both Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism. We are incapable, without the help of grace, of achieving, nay, of so much as beginning, the task of our salvation. In this sense it is absolutely gratuitous. But

if any one declares that man's free will, inspired and excited by God, in no way co-operates in response to the summons and excitation from God, so preparing to obtain the grace of justification and that man cannot refuse his consent, if he so desires, but that his behaviour is that of an inanimate object, that he is in no respect an agent and remains for ever passive, . . if any one declares that man's free will has been lost and extinguished since the sin of Adam, that it is a purely nominal reality, or rather nominal without reality, a fiction introduced into the Church by Satan, let him be anathema!¹¹

Nowhere was the disagreement between the great Church, fighting for the maintenance of the authentic Christian conception of the relations between God and man, and the dissenting bodies, sprung from the crisis in the development of the Renaissance, more profound or absolute than in this doctrine of Justification. Thence derived most of the other doctrinal differences. The sacramental theory in particular was the consequence of the position adopted on either side with regard

¹¹ Canons 4 and 5 of the Decrees on Justification of the Sixth Session, 19th January 1547.

to the question of Justification. The secret motive of the Lutherans and the other Protestants was to destroy the power of the clergy. No factor was of greater assistance in the attempt than the sacramental doctrine. On the one hand, a certain number of traditional sacraments rested solely on the immemorial practice of the Church and the unanimous agreement of the different branches of Christendom throughout the ages. The administration of the sacraments, on the other hand, had provided a loophole through which certain abuses had crept into ecclesiastical discipline. Nothing could be easier than to invoke the negative argument of the silence of the Bible or to excite popular indignation by depicting alleged clerical frauds. The attack had been led by Luther with his usual violence in the very beginning of his revolt against the Church.

The gangrene of hostility to the supernatural—the plague of modern times—had not, however, affected the sixteenth century. The influence of the clergy in Catholic countries to-day is sapped and undermined by doubt cast on the reality of the eternal salvation which the clergy preach. Everybody in the sixteenth century believed in and earnestly desired salvation. The social usefulness of the clerical order could not be impaired by any insistence on the uselessness of salvation or the vanity of hopes concerning eternal happiness. But it could be utterly destroyed if it were shown that salvation was very possible and even easy without any clerical intervention. Protestantism sought to prove this. It went farther still: it sought to prove that recourse to the ministerial office of the clergy would be an idolatrous act calling for the thunder of the divine wrath. Against such interested and tendentious affirmations, the Council of Trent re-established the traditional doctrines. While pointing out the rich abundance of the assistance given by God to man in the varied and complete cycle of the Sacraments, it erected in the centre of the whole system the sacred altar on which the Eucharistic Victim is sacrificed by the hand of the priest and in virtue of his consecratory words. Baptism no doubt is possible without the intervention of a priest, and faith may be derived from family tradition or the Bible, but as in

those Japanese communities founded by St Francis Xavier, the Apostle of the Far East, and only recently rediscovered in the last century, there is a risk of such treasures disappearing in course of time and it would be impossible in any event to have the Holy Communion, remission of sins in penance, or the supreme consolation of Unction for the dying. Again, without the priest the sovereign homage offered in the daily sacrifice of the Mass would be absent from the earth.

But it was not enough to restore its grandeur and indispensability to the function performed by the priest his person had to be given such dignity as commands respect and inspires confidence. Men are not guided in their conduct by mere abstract propositions, even supported by the most cogent proof and the most sacred texts. The education of the priest was rightly considered by the Council as one of the most indispensable steps to be taken for the renewal of the ancient Church. In condemning abuses, in taking effective precautions to prevent their recurrence, it accomplished the most useful task and put a definite stop to the perilous progress of the revels which had been made possible by past disorders. The principles of clerical education were very properly drawn up in accordance with the necessities of the office which the clergy are called upon to perform. Their duty is to teach souls the Truth and to provide for them the food of supernatural life, to hold up before them as a model the Life of Jesus Christ, and to help them to live according to that model by comforting them with those means of assistance which Christ instituted. Two things are necessary for the priest to that end: learning and sanctity. As it is his mission to be the representative of Jesus Christ before the faithful, so it is his duty to take Christ Himself for model, like Him to set an example at the same time as he administers a precept, like Him to make God the centre, the all in all of his life. This lofty ambition is inculcated in the future priest in the seminary by convergent methods throughout the long, laborious years of his clerical education.

The preliminary work of the Council was done by saints it was by saints that it was carried on and extended.

SOURCES

J Le Plat, *Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini potissimum illustrandum spectantium amplissima collectio*, 7 vols, Louvain, 1781-7 *Concilium Tridentinum, Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatum Nova Collectio*, edidit Societas Goerresiana *Diariorum Pars Prima Herculis Severoli Commentarius*, Angeli Massarelli *Diaria* i-iv, ed Sebastianus Merkle, Freiburg-i-B, 1901 A Theiner, *Acta genuina Concilii Tridentini*, 2 vols, Agram, 1875

CHAPTER III

THE CATHOLIC REFORM IN ACTION

Summary 1 The Reform in Italy 2 The development of the Society of Jesus and its share in the work of Reform 3 The expansion of ecclesiastical learning after the Council of Trent

I. THE REFORM IN ITALY

ITALY, as we have seen, was the first country to show signs of reforming zeal. In Italy, also, the decrees of the Council of Trent affected most immediately and most profoundly the practice of daily life. The ground was better prepared there than elsewhere. Italy had been the first country to be the scene of an abandonment of the principles of morality and a repudiation of the rigour of Christian discipline, but naturalism had soonest run its course there and a reaction had set in towards the true principles of the religion of Christ just at the time of the Lutheran revolt in Germany. Italy had produced the Theatines, Somascans, Barnabites, Capuchins, and Ursulines. Admirable bishops had raised the standard there of true reform. The Council of Trent had reaped the benefit of their devoted and fruitful enterprise. The young Society of Jesus also had established its head-quarters in Rome and its influence was bringing an increasing weight to bear on the development of morals among the faithful and in the ranks of the clergy.

St. Ignatius Loyola had opened in 1552 the *Collegium Germanicum*, the first seminary in Rome for the education of German clerics who found it difficult to make their theological studies in their own country. Reginald Pole, whom Pope Paul III had created a cardinal on the 22nd December 1536 (he was not ordained priest until twenty years later), was attracted by the scheme and in 1556 established the English College in Rome. Such notable examples furnished the Council of Trent with the idea and the model of seminary institutions in every diocese in Christendom. In 1563 the Pope applied the new decree of the Council by establishing a seminary for the Roman clergy, the *Collegium Romanum*, the direction of which was entrusted to

the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. St Charles Borromeo, a nephew of Pius IV, raised by him to the purple and intimately concerned in the conduct of the most important business of the Church, showed the most disinterested and ardent zeal for reform. Nepotism for once in a way served the interests of the Church. The saint lost no time in endowing the archdiocese of Milan, to which he had been appointed, with a number of seminaries, amongst them a Swiss College for the education of priests from the confederation. The Statutes he drew up for these seminaries were reproduced practically everywhere.

The activity of that great reforming spirit did not, however, stop here. But before following him throughout the whole of his beneficent career we must return to Rome, there to sketch the portrait of another very great saint of a very personal and original character, the centre, towards the middle of the sixteenth century, of a reforming activity of the highest importance—St Philip Neri.¹

On Sunday, the 26th May 1787, Goethe noted in his Journal: ‘To-day was my Saint’s day: I celebrated it in his honour with cheerful devotion, in his own fashion, and according to his teaching.’² The 26th May is St. Philip’s feast day in the Roman Calendar. Critics are sometimes heard to complain that the Counter-Reformation, in its process of repelling the attacks of Luther and Calvin, considered itself bound to adopt a repulsive attitude, to bristle with asceticism and austerity. If there had been no Luther, above all, if there had been no Calvin, a fruitful alliance, we are told, would have united the Renaissance and genuine piety, blended the human and divine—the great dream brought to realization in the heart of the Middle Ages, and of which Julius II was surely thinking when he planned his designs for the beautifying of St. Peter’s and the Vatican and when he caused Michelangelo to depict him in his decoration.

¹ There is an admirable biography with an exhaustive discussion of the sources by L. Ponnelle and L. Bordet, Paris, 1928.

² Cf. *Italienische Reise*, vol. II, p. 49, of Krober’s edition, Leipzig, 1913. Goethe continues: ‘Neri has expressed his doctrine in one simple maxim *Spernere mundum, spernere te ipsum, spernere te sperni.* What else is there to say?’ Cf. also *ibid.* at p. 191. ‘The humorous Saint’.

of Julius' own mausoleum as Moses, the great prophet who had led his Church to the Pisgah-vision of the Promised Land of Intellectual Unity. Religion might have ceased to be a mere mechanical routine and grown serious without losing its attractiveness. Criticism of this sort fails to take account of St. Philip Neri, as it neglects also St. Francis of Sales and all those whom a modern historian has described as the 'devout humanists'.

Philip Neri was born at Florence on the 21st July 1515, the youngest son of Francesco Neri, an attorney in that city. He was at first apprenticed to his uncle, a prosperous merchant, but soon was drawn to the service of God in works of beneficence. He travelled for a time and finally settled in Rome, about 1548, where he founded the *Confraternity of the Holy Trinity* for the lodging and entertainment of poor pilgrims. Certain persons of high degree came under the spell of his character, his spiritual fervour was combined with a gift of friendship, gracious manner, and kindly words. He, at all events, was not the man to be accused, like Calvin, of showing only the wrathful face of God, or, like Luther, of reducing all things to the dread compulsion of a harsh predestination. His whole life radiated the precept which is a brief abstract of the spirit of the Gospel as it is understood by the Catholic Church 'If you love Me, keep my commandments'. Very different was his spirit to that of Luther, to whom the Law existed not to be fulfilled but merely to convict Man of his own impotence. Philip Neri was ordained priest in 1551. He then took up his residence at San Girolamo, where an association of priests served the adjoining church, the centre at the time of a confraternity well known in Rome. Such was the environment in which Philip exercised his ministry and attracted young men to him by the charm of his high spirits, his gaiety, and infectious enthusiasm. A fellowship began to form around him which adopted no formal common rule or authority or hierarchy, and from such humble beginnings, about the year 1554 or 1555, dates the *Oratory*. Philip preached several times a day, and with such a gift of kindling devotion as inspired his audience with his own enthusiasm.

He would then invite his companions to speak. The reading of a book at the beginning of their meeting supplied them with a topic for an intimate, spontaneous exchange of views, and the authors they liked best were those who insisted most strongly on the love of God, the authors of the Fourth Gospel and the works of the *Imitation of Christ*¹. After some conversation in the oratory the little company (their number rose before Philip's death to two thousand) went in procession through the streets, still discoursing or singing hymns, on a pilgrimage to the great basilicas, St John Lateran, St. Peter's, Sta Croce in Gerusalemme. When they returned from their walk, they said prayers. The sight of Philip as he prayed made a deep impression.

The Father prayed [an eye-witness relates], and you could see in him an intense fervour of devotion, his whole body quivered and it seemed as though he were trembling while he held a conversation with God and, although his prayer lasted an hour, we thought it but a short time and would gladly have remained there all night so delightful was the experience. And he said 'Such milk does the Lord give to them that begin to serve Him . . .'²

These spiritual exercises gradually assumed a definite shape without losing their character of ingenuous freshness and life which defied the monotony of routine. People came to the Oratory from all parts of the city, worshipped the Blessed Sacrament, said their prayers, discussed spiritual matters, warmed themselves at the hearth of the love of God, and sang hymns which, despite their simplicity, were in no way superficial in content. Priests and laymen thronged about St. Philip. He was as adept in playing with children as in taking part in the deliberations of cardinals and the discussions of theologians. He had above all a special talent for converting sinners. The Oratory became a sort of national institution in Rome, which was now being rigorously stirred from all sides by currents of reform. Pope Gregory XIII transferred the confraternity to Sta Maria in Vallicella in the heart of Rome, the site on which

¹ All the contemporary authorities mention the works of John Gerson. It is, however, possible that the *Imitation of Christ* was one of their favourite books, for in the sixteenth century this work of à Kempis was often attributed to Gerson.

² Cf. Ponnelle and Bordet, *St. Philippe Neri*, at p. 124.

St. Philip later built the Chiesa Nuova. The Papal Court flocked to the new establishment. A revolution had taken place in the public mind. The cardinals had set the example. 'Such purity of life,' declared the Spanish canonist Azpilcueta, who visited Rome the year after the Jubilee (1576), 'such piety, prudence, sense of justice, continence, and ability of every kind have not been seen in their College for centuries.'

Either from self-interest or from inclination the courtiers quickly adapted their morals to those of their patrons.

The spiritual life, once an object of contempt and derision among the magnates, now provoked neither astonishment nor emotion. It had become a universal practice. . . The Oratory made a generous contribution to the rapid revival of morals and piety at the Papal Court. Courtiers whose secular ambitions had been shaken came there to complete their conversion.¹

Priests gathered round St. Philip in due course and with him formed the nucleus of a new Congregation, although he had a marked dislike for becoming the founder of an Order and imposing any fixed set of rules upon the friends and disciples whom his influence and sanctity had attracted. One of those who joined him was an historian of the first rank, Cesar Baronius, the future cardinal, who was destined to succeed him, in 1593, as Superior of the Oratory and who had begun in 1563, at St. Philip's suggestion, his *Ecclesiastical Annals* (12 vols., 1588-93) to reply to the Protestant historical work known as the *Magdeburg Centuries*.² The enemies of the Church had discovered a new form of tactics. Instead of seeking merely to oppose the Bible to the Church, they attempted to submerge her in a deluge of all the scandals of her history and at the same time to discover throughout the centuries of Roman idolatry traces of the

¹ The testimony of Talpa, the collaborator of Philip Neri, ap. Ponnelle and Bordet, op. cit., at p. 267.

² For an exact appreciation of Baronius and much entertaining comment on the *Centuriators* of Magdeburg and their modern successors, the reader is referred to Mr M. V. Hay's admirable essay, *A Chain of Error in Scottish History*, London, 1927. See also Pastor, *History of the Popes*, vol. xix, chapter vii.

The learned contributor to the *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii, 1903, Mr R. V. Laurence, observes, p. 688, 'Rome became again a centre of Christian learning, and the *Annals* of Baronius were worthy to stand by the *Centuries* of Magdeburg.'

ancestors of Lutheranism. Thanks to the Oratory, and more especially to Baronius, its refutation quickly followed the assertion of this audacious enterprise.¹

The founder of the Oratory died on the 26th May 1595, at the age of eighty, leaving the most venerated and beloved memory in Rome and throughout Italy. The Oratorians carried on his eminently beneficent work of completing the union, at once so necessary and so important, of piety and learning.

St Philip Neri and St. Charles Borromeo had been associated from the earliest days, despite a few passing disagreements, in the closest bonds of a trusting and intimate friendship.

Charles Borromeo was born on the 2nd October 1538, in his father's castle of Arona, a small town on the Lago Maggiore. They were nobles in the district, where a colossal bronze statue, erected in 1697, now stands to commemorate the saint. From his earliest years he evinced an apt disposition for the ecclesiastical state and the service of God. He received the tonsure at the early age of twelve and with it, in accordance with the lamentable custom of the time, the abbey of San Gratiniano at Arona.²

Charles was only twenty-two when his uncle, Giovanni-Angelo de' Medici, who had become Pope under the name of

¹ 'The first volume of this vast collection' (the *Magdeburg Centuries*), writes Mr Hay, 'appeared in 1559 under the direction of Flacius Illyricus at Bâle. It was really a collection of scandals and calumnies designed to prove that the whole body of Catholics were, and had always been, the foulest of the human species, that "the mark of the Beast was blanded on their foreheads". Their research (sc of Flacius and his associates) was a search for scandal, they specialized in misrepresentation, they mutilated, stole, and even forged but they established the method of collective work and the idea of the continuity of history.' Op cit., at pp. 3-4.

Begun in 1559 the *Centuries* were completed in thirteen volumes by 1574. The authors of the work described it as a history of the origins, progress of evil machinations of Anti-Christ or of the Popes. Baronius took the lead in opposing them not with mere controversial criticism but with a documented record of the Church's history. A number of other contemporary Catholic writers dealt with various aspects and statements of the *Centuries*. Among them were the Jesuit Canisius and Thomas Harpsfield, a scholar of Douai, who died in England a prisoner under the penal laws. Cf. Pastor, *History of the Popes*, vol. xix, p. 264 (English edition of 1930).

² Some excuse, however, for the grant of benefices to children may be found in the fact that in the majority of cases they served as bursaries or scholarships for the promotion of education. Calvin, also as a boy, had enjoyed the benefit of a similar endowment.

Pius IV, brought him to Rome, and recognizing his great talents and youthful sanctity, appointed him cardinal, archbishop of Milan, and legate of Romagna, the Marches, and Bologna. The young prelate was not carried away by such an accumulation of honours. He devoted all the energy of his mind to the great work of reform and was largely responsible for the reopening of the Council of Trent in 1562. But he would not wait for the conclusions of the Council's deliberations; he insisted that the Pope should suppress the abuses which discredited the Curia. He took the principal part in drawing up and publishing the *Roman Catechism* which was to prove so useful for religious instruction in parishes. On the death of his uncle, he hastened to return to his diocese, and there he continued to reside.

Milan was the most extensive diocese in all Italy. It stretched over part of Venezia, Switzerland, and the State of Genoa. The province included fifteen suffragan sees. Charles set the example by rigorously enforcing the salutary decrees of Trent. He introduced the Jesuits into his diocese and received their vigorous support. But he was determined to have devoted helpers among the secular clergy itself in the evangelization of the flock committed to his care. He gathered the most zealous of his priests together and formed a congregation with an elastic constitution modelled on the Oratory, which he would have liked to bring into his own jurisdiction. They called themselves the *Oblates of St. Ambrose* and were later known as the *Oblates of St. Charles*. Such energetic measures and the unremitting zeal with which he visited his immense diocese (he held numerous synods, five of the province, eleven of the diocese), above all his personal sanctity and spirit of mortification and prayer, his heroic self-forgetful devotion to duty, of which he gave a memorable example during the plague of 1576,¹ his simplicity of manners and sweetness of temper, combined to win him a supreme influence for good which has kept his memory ever green. It brought about many conversions and disarmed even the most

¹ The great archbishop's example was nobly followed in a later outbreak of plague by his cousin Federigo, archbishop of Milan from 1595 to 1631, and has been immortalized by the genius of Manzoni in *I Promessi Sposi*. To Federigo we owe the foundation, in 1609, of the Ambrosian Library.

inveterate and scandalous opposition (notably on the part of the *Umiliati*, who had long ceased to practise their primitive piety and one of whom actually shot at the archbishop in 1569, as he knelt at prayer in his chapel)

2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS AND ITS SHARE IN THE WORK OF REFORM

The work of reform in Italy was also carried out by the convergent efforts of the numerous orders whose foundation or return to the simplicity of their origins has been recorded Theatines, Somascans, Barnabites, Capuchins, Ursulines, and many others, with the addition, towards the end of the century, of the Camillans (a congregation of Clerks Regular, established to comfort the sick and the dying, by St. Camillus of Lellis, 1550–1614, a convert of St. Philip's, canonized in 1746), vied with one another in the Christian education of the people and everywhere strove to revive the practice of the evangelical virtues. But the Order which, beyond question, played the most important part in the religious restoration of the second half of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth, not only in Italy but throughout the whole Catholic world, was the Society of Jesus, and the Society therefore, almost from the beginning, was the object of the special and bitter resentment of the sects, Lutheran and Calvinist alike.

The inner force of expansion possessed by a religious Order may be estimated from the number of saints it has given to the Church and from the extent of the area over which its apostolate has been exercised. The Society of Jesus furnished saints who for the candour of their innocence and the zeal of their charity are the admiration of the Catholic world. There were saints such as the well-known youths, Stanislas Kostka (1550–67), Luigi di Gonzaga (St. Aloysius) (1568–91), and John Berchmans (1599–1625); others who set the world an example of the virtues which constitute the grace of mature years, such as St. Ignatius Loyola, its inspired founder, St. Francis Xavier, the most famous of missionaries, St. Peter Canisius, whose career will be told later, St. Robert Bellarmine, St. Francis Borgia,

duke of Gandia and former viceroy of Catalonia, who entered the Society at the age of thirty-six and was destined to be its third general

The Society had spread rapidly in Italy (where it had established its head-quarters), in Spain, its founder's country of origin, in Belgium and in Portugal, but more slowly in France and Germany. It sent a succession of missionaries to England, numbers of whom endured imprisonment, torture, and death under the penal laws of Elizabeth.¹ The little book of the *Spiritual Exercises* continued to work marvels, and, oddly enough, it was not by the force of its logic which we find so impressive that the men of the sixteenth century were most affected. Cochlaeus, the theologian, who had performed the *Exercises* under the guidance of Fr. Le Fèvre, in 1541, at Worms, said: 'I am overjoyed to see the masters at last disposed to appeal to the emotions.' Ignatius addressed himself not only to the intellect but to the heart. This was almost a novelty.

St Ignatius died on the 31st July 1556 and the Society then numbered twelve provinces, one hundred and one houses, and nearly a thousand members. Sixty years later, 1616, its progress had been little short of marvellous, thirty-seven provinces, four hundred and thirty-six houses, and thirteen thousand, one hundred, and twelve members.

Two men in particular here call for consideration. Peter Canisius and Francis Xavier. The example of the latter shows

¹ The Jesuit mission in England began with the coming of Campion and Parsons in 1580. They came to reinforce the priests from the Catholic 'seminaries' established abroad, to supply the ministrations of religion to those who still held to the old Faith in England. The first of these 'seminary priests' had been supplied by Allen's college of Douai (see below, p. 219), founded in 1568. The missionary priests came to England with orders that they were to hold aloof from politics and devote themselves to ministering to the faithful Catholics and restoring to the Church those who had lapsed from it. Before the first Jesuit missionaries left Rome they obtained an official declaration that the Bull of Pius V did not impose, *rebus sic stantibus*, on the Catholics in England any disobedience to the Queen's civil authority. Their instructions were that 'they were not to entangle themselves in matters of State', or even write any political news, or engage in talk against the Queen, or allow others to do so. At Tyburn on the day of his death Campion told the crowd that he prayed for Elizabeth, 'your Queen and my Queen' (Cf. Pollen, *English Catholics under Elizabeth*, pp. 292-6.)

the Society as the cherisher of large and far-sighted ambitions, the Apostle of the Indies and Japan, the hero of an extraordinary epic, the former, the apostle of the German lands and Switzerland, who won back from Lutheranism a great part of the Germans and finally arrested the progress of the Protestant Reformation in those countries, reminds us that the Society also knew how to adapt itself to the necessities of the struggle which was contemporaneous with its origins.

Francis Xavier was a Basque of noble family, born in his mother's castle of Xavero, near Pampeluna, on the 7th April 1506. While Francis was a lecturer in Paris on the philosophy of Aristotle, St. Ignatius had lured him from the temptations of the world. He left Rome in answer to the appeal for missionaries of John III, king of Portugal, and arrived at Goa on the 6th May 1542. His first act was to renounce the plenipotentiary powers conferred upon him by the Holy See and to place himself unreservedly at the disposal of the archbishop, Albuquerque. The state of Christianity at Goa was lamentable: ignorance, indifference, licentiousness, cruelty to the natives, were rife everywhere, so that the Portuguese of the colony gave the natives of India the sorriest impression of the religion they represented. Francis began by attempting to convert the settlers. His burning eloquence and the example of his sanctity overcame every obstacle. He was then free to turn his attention to the natives. He preached to them a religion of which they could see the most obvious and touching expression in his gentleness, kindness, self-denying poverty, and boundless disinterestedness.

From India he made his way to Malacca, the Banda islands, and the Maluccas, and then retraced his steps by Malacca (1547) and Manassar to the island of Ceylon, where he converted the king of Kandy with many of his people. A Japanese refugee having praised in his hearing the high intelligence of his compatriots, Francis was seized with an imperious desire to win them to Christ. He therefore sailed for Japan in 1549, the first missionary to set foot in the country, and preached there until 1552 with extraordinary success. From Japan he would have made his way into China, but before reaching that land of

mystery he was stricken by disease and died in a wretched hut in the island of San-chan on the Canton river on the 3rd December 1552. But his heart was overflowing with consolation and the last lines of the *Te Deum* were on his lips as he strained his eyes towards China. His body was brought back to Malacca and thence conveyed with great solemnity to Goa on the 15th March 1554. His work was carried on by the Jesuits in the Far East, and its results remain to this day in all the lands in which he was the pioneer of a new era in the missions.¹

Peter Canisius, the first Jesuit and the second apostle of Germany, was born at Nijmegen in the Guelderland provinces of the Netherlands on the 8th May 1521. His name was Hondt ('Hound'), latinized as Canisius. It was the year in which Luther at Worms was making the break with the Holy See irreparable, and when Ignatius Loyola, recovering in his ancestral castle from the wound received at the siege of Pampeluna, was considering an abandonment of the world to devote himself entirely to the service of Jesus Christ. Twenty-two years later to the day, the 8th May 1543, Canisius formed the resolution to enter the Society of Jesus. He had just completed the *Exercises* under the guidance of Fr Le Fèvre (Faber), who had arrived in Germany in 1540 as theologian in the suite of Ortiz, the representative of Charles V. The first Jesuit house in Germany was established in Cologne, in 1544, by the energy of Canisius in face of innumerable difficulties. The Jesuits had from the beginning adapted themselves without effort to the new conditions governing intellectual life in the Church and devoted themselves to Biblical studies. Peter Canisius was so deeply familiar with the Bible that he could neither speak nor write without embellishing what he had to say with texts from Scripture or allusions to it. His mind and being moved in the atmosphere of the Bible. But he did not neglect the Fathers of the Church, and he was also a close student of St Thomas. He was only twenty-five years old when Cardinal Otto Truchsess

¹ Schmidlin, *Katholische Missionsgeschichte*, 1925, pp. 234 et seq. The English translation of St Francis Xavier's life by Père Bouhours (1684) was made by the poet John Dryden.

secured the permission of his superiors to attach him to Fr. Le Jay, who was entrusted with the task of representing the cardinal at the Council of Trent. The suspension of the Council brought Canisius to Rome, a visit which was the occasion of the celebrated declaration to St Ignatius which reflects the marvellous, spontaneous discipline of the first Jesuits under the authority of their superiors.

In the first place I declare that, with the help of God, it is a matter of complete indifference to me whether he orders me to remain here for ever or sends me to Sicily, to India, or any other place. Moreover, if I am sent to Sicily, I simply say that I shall be delighted to fulfil any duty, as cook or gardener, porter, student or professor of any branch of learning whatsoever, even though it be unknown to me.¹ Canisius was sent to Messina, but in October 1549 was back again in Germany.

The documents which have been collected with reference to his activity enable the historian to form an estimate of the immense progress Lutheranism had made in the German lands about that time. On Luther's death in 1546, it seemed that his party had definitely triumphed over the 'Romanists' whom he had repeatedly derided and abused. The probability is that nine Germans in ten had been won over to his ideas. The conquest of the remaining fraction seemed to be a mere matter of time, and Lutheranism did in fact increase in numbers until the death, in 1579, of the Emperor Maximilian II.

Canisius, therefore, on his return from Italy to engage in the struggle against Protestantism had arrived at a moment when the battle was three parts lost. His first merit was not to lose heart. He had an organization behind him of inestimable force: the Society of Jesus. He was not alone. In spite of all his talent and inexhaustible energy he would without doubt have been powerless before the immensity of the evil, but he was directed, supported, and helped. He had only to ask to receive the necessary reinforcements, although he was not always sent as many as

¹ Braunsberger has gathered all the documents relating to Canisius in a monumental collection, *B P Canissi, S J, Epistulae et Acta*, 1896-1906, 8 vols., Freiburg-im-Brisgau. A life of St Peter Canisius, by the Rev J. Brodrick, S J, is also in preparation.

he desired Superiors have to take circumstances into account and the limits of human conditions 'You must sometimes take bones along with the meat,' St. Ignatius wrote to him one day. But in spite of everything, the essential was achieved Canisius had a Chief of Staff whose tactics he understood thoroughly and whose plan of campaign he scrupulously carried out Protestantism had prevailed by pandering to individualism, by assuming scientific airs, by appealing to the princes and winning them over to its cause Canisius opposed weapon to weapon, missile to missile. To individualism he opposed obedience, an eminently evangelical virtue, to erudition in the Scriptures and the Fathers, of which the Lutherans had claimed the monopoly, he sought to oppose a more exact and profound learning in the Scriptures and the Fathers, to the ambition of the Lutheran, the staunch determination of the Catholic princes

Above all he aimed at the reform of morals, which Lutheranism had sadly neglected He perceived clearly that the future lay with whichever side secured the youth, and devoted himself to the all-important field of education. In answer to his appeal Catholic colleges sprang up everywhere in southern Germany, which had been less affected by the Lutheran propaganda at Ingolstadt (where in 1550 he had become rector of the university) and Prague in 1556, at Munich and Augsburg in 1559, Trier in 1560, Mainz and Innsbruck in 1561, Dillingen in 1563, Braunsberg in 1564, Speyer in 1566, Wurzburg in 1567, Halle in 1569, Fulda in 1571, Gratz in 1573, Lucerne in 1574, Heiligenstadt in 1575, Molsheim, Coblenz, and Paderborn in 1580, Freiburg in Switzerland in 1582 Munster was founded later in 1588, Ratisbon in 1589, Emmerich and Constance in 1592

The movement had received a strong impulse nothing was to stop its progress. These colleges were devoted to the education of priests and a well-informed Catholic laity, the two most pressing necessities. Bad priests and bad nobles had been responsible for the spread of Lutheranism good priests and a sound aristocracy were to be the means of restoring Catholicism. The populace then, as ever, followed its leaders. This does not mean that Canisius relied only on the princes to impose the traditional

religion He fully realized that it was necessary to instruct the people in their duties he did not consider a mere passive conformity to be sufficient To the people he devoted the best of his activity and talent He was the author, at the request of Ferdinand, king of the Romans, of a *Catechism* (1556-7), which ran into more than four hundred editions in a century and was translated into all languages his *Summa Doctrinae Christianae* became a text-book. He published prayer-books and innumerable sermons, all addressed to the people. The children who ran to meet him in the street and took his hand and asked for his blessing were well aware that he was the friend of the humble and the poor But Canisius did not neglect the influence of the more prosperous classes He exerted himself to form a Catholic élite, and this was the object of the Jesuit colleges. They gave a solid education¹ and year by year sent out a contingent of young men into society who were both instructed and devout. The clergy were reinvigorated and revived. The seminary in their case completed the work which the college had begun. Nobles and merchants, who in many cases had sat with the future priests as fellow pupils in the classroom, gave their influence to support the reforms which the Council of Trent had decreed but which still remained to be carried out The pacific nature of the new crusade is specially noteworthy. As the characteristic feature of Luther's writings was their violence and vulgarity, so the works of Canisius were distinguished for their restrained and lofty dignity The Protestant historian, H. Bohmer, observes with reference to the Dutch Jesuit's *Catechism* 'Its chief merit is that it is free of all polemics in the proper sense of the word.'

When Canisius died at Freiburg, in Switzerland, on the

¹ The course of studies in the Jesuit colleges was based on that of the universities of the time Classical studies played a large part in the course, Latin being the common language of educated men in Europe There was also a mathematical and scientific course, and in the case of young students of the Society itself who showed a special aptitude for these studies, professorships in the colleges gave ample scope for their higher mastery Among the earliest of the Jesuits who won distinction in mathematical and astronomical research was the Bavarian Christoph Clav, a professor of the Roman College, best known by his latinized name of Clavius He was the chief expert in the scientific work for Gregory XIII's reform of the Calendar (1582).

21st December 1597, the battle was well won. Henceforward it was certain that not all Germany would be lost to the Catholic Church. Maximilian of Bavaria and Ferdinand of Styria were about to succeed to their thrones. They countered the uncompromising spirit of the Lutheran princes with an equal determination. The ecclesiastical principalities plucked up courage again. Both parties fortified their positions, and the religious map of the German lands, now almost equally divided between the two confessions, became more or less stereotyped. It was not to undergo any material alteration.

What has been said of the Jesuit colleges in Germany is also applicable to all the other countries in which the Society carried out the same kind of apostolate, notably Poland, but in a lesser degree to France where the Society, before obtaining an entry at all, had to overcome the opposition of Parliament and the ancient Sorbonne, then dominated by a Gallican spirit far removed from the absolute devotion to the Holy See which was the distinguishing characteristic of the new Society.

3. THE REVIVAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL LEARNING AFTER THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

Another consequence of the Council of Trent was to inspire fresh life and renewed vigour into ecclesiastical studies, which made enormous progress for reasons not difficult to determine. In the first place the very urgency of the struggle taxed all the energy of the Catholic world and compelled a vigorous reaction in defence of the imperilled faith. The Church was challenged, as has been several times observed, on the ground of Biblical scholarship and patristic learning and accepted the contest. The result was that without abandoning the traditional and useful scholastic philosophy, she urged her defenders to an intensive study of philology, history, scripture, and archaeology, so that the two most characteristic works of the late sixteenth century were, on the one hand, the *Disputationes de Controversis Christianae Fidei adversus hujus Temporis Haereticos* (3 vols., Rome, 1581) of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, and, on the other, the *Annals* before referred to of Baronius.

A second explanation of the magnificent expansion of ecclesiastical studies in Catholic circles is to be found in the vast widening of the field which the labours of the Council of Trent itself involved. An enormous amount of work had been accomplished at the Council. Theologians had compared their individual opinions in lengthy discussions, had defined the precise limits of dogma, and cast a flood of light on areas which had hitherto been given over to free discussion. Doctrine had been defined and in a manner crystallized. Catholic writers could thenceforth engage in controversy upon a solid foundation, with a definite plan of campaign in the struggle against heresy. They could triumphantly oppose the majestic *unity* of Catholicism to the perpetual *variations* and congenital instability of Protestantism.

Different theories finally emerged with regard to certain problems, such as the concurrence of grace and the human will or the essential nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and were discussed under the supreme control of the Church by various schools. Theologians, so far from being trammelled by clear definition of vital truths, had a wide field for investigation and research in their consequences and applications and on questions that still remained open to debate.

For all these reasons the years between 1550 and 1650 saw a whole host of theologians, exegetes, apologists, moralists, and mystic writers, some of the highest distinction.

Of theologians there flourished in the early sixteenth century the Thomist, Tommaso de Vio, surnamed Cajetan, from his native town of Gaeta, then called *Cajetta*. As Papal legate he had met Luther at Augsburg in the autumn of 1518. He died at Rome in 1534, leaving a Commentary on the *Summa* of St. Thomas which is accounted among the best. Bannez, Pedro de Soto,¹ Domenico de Soto, a confessor of the Emperor Charles V, John of St. Thomas, and Thomas of Lemos, were the most distinguished Thomists of the time. They were

¹ He had been appointed to the Hebrew chair at Oxford when Cardinal Pole sent him in September 1555 to argue with Latimer and Ridley in the Divinity School. The Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford at the time was another Dominican, Fray de Garcia.

all Dominicans, members of the Order traditionally devoted to the memory and theological opinions of the great Dominican.

The young Society of Jesus offers still more familiar names in the sphere of theology. Laynez, Salmeron, and Canisius, all of whom played an important part in the Council, were succeeded by the Spaniard Gabriel Vasquez (1551-1604), another Thomist commentator, Leonard Leys or Lessius, a Fleming, who was born near Antwerp in 1554 and died at Louvain in 1623, and, most famous of all, Francisco Suarez (1548-1617), in whom, says Bossuet, 'most of the moderns are to be heard'.

Suarez was born in Grenada and studied at Salamanca. The Lenten sermons of Ramirez made such an impression upon his mind that he resolved to enter the Jesuit novitiate at Monterey in Galicia at the age of sixteen. He gave no indication at the time of his future eminence.

He was so backward and experienced such difficulty in applying himself to his work that he thought of giving it up. His intelligence developed quite suddenly, as though some unexpected grace had intervened, and his Superior, Fr. Gutierrez, predicted a brilliant future for him. Back he went to his books, dogged, persevering labour made him in the end the most illustrious theologian of the Society of Jesus. Of his sixty-nine years of life and fifty-three of religious profession he spent forty-seven in teaching, first at the *Collegium Romanum* and thereafter at Alcala, Salamanca, and Coimbra, where he remained for twenty years and acquired an enormous reputation. He was surnamed 'the second Augustine'. Pope Paul V, in a Brief dated the 2nd October 1607, applied to him the epithets *eximus et pius*, eminent and devout, and they have clung to him. He was also noted for his wonderful humility and exemplary religious spirit. It was said of him by his acquaintance: 'To see the time he spends in prayer, you would think he neglected his books; to see the time he gives to his books, you would think he neglected his prayers.' It has indeed been estimated that he spent no less than six hours a day in pious exercises, but he could yet devote ten hours to intellectual labour, and the works he left run to 23,000 folio pages. Quiet and self-restrained in contro-

versy, he never gave offence to an opponent. Death appeared to him as a well-merited rest for a servant who has accomplished an arduous task 'I should never have thought it was so sweet to die,' were his last words on his death-bed. He was the greatest theologian of the Society, one of the greatest of all time.

Luis Molina, another Jesuit, may be mentioned along with Suarez. He was not so erudite or profound, but his mind was subtle and penetrating. He addressed himself to the difficult problem of efficacious grace, which was hotly disputed among most theologians of the time, the problem of the reconciliation of grace and God's foreknowledge and man's free will, a problem almost as old as the origin of human thought, and had the honour of attaching his name to the celebrated treatise *Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiae Donis . . . Concordia*, published at Lisbon in 1588, which contained one of the most elegant solutions of a baffling riddle. Molinists thereafter formed a distinct school of theology as in earlier times the rival followers of Thomas Aquinas or Duns Scotus had done. Molina was born at Cuenca in New Castile in 1535, professed theology at Evora for twenty years, and died at Madrid on the 12th October 1600.

The other Orders had their theologians also. The Carmelites of Salamanca produced a vast commentary on St Thomas, while the Capuchins could boast of Francis Titelmans and Laurence of Brindisi.

Scriptural exegesis which Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin had claimed for their own special province was another favourite subject with the scholars of the Society of Jesus. The Spanish Jesuit, Salmeron, a colleague of St Peter Canisius in the university of Ingolstadt, and of Laynez at the Council of Trent, also spent his life in exploring the New Testament. He was later given the youthful Bellarmine to help him in editing his voluminous works. The works were published in eleven volumes in Madrid (1597-1602), though Salmeron himself died at the age of seventy, in 1585.

Juan Maldonado (*Maldonatus*), another Spanish Jesuit, devoted himself to the study of the Gospels. He was born in 1534 at Las Casas de la Reina in Andalusia, professed theology for

a time in the Jesuit college at Clermont, and after 1564, with great success, at Paris. One of his most distinguished pupils was St Francis of Sales. He converted a number of Calvinist ministers in conference upon the Scriptures, but incurred the wrath of the Sorbonne. Pope Gregory XIII summoned him to Rome in 1580, and there he died in 1583. The crowd of students which flocked to hear him at times was such that he had to deliver his lectures in the open air, for the lack of a hall big enough to hold the throng of hearers. Richard Simon (1638–1712), once an Oratorian and himself an eminent expositor of Scripture, though far from well disposed to Maldonado, wrote with reference to him: ‘Of all the commentators hitherto passed in review, few have interpreted with such care, and indeed with such success, the literal meaning of the Gospels.’ Maldonado’s *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas*, which were published at Pont-à-Mousson after his death (1596–7), have often been reprinted and may still be profitably consulted.

Another Jesuit, a Fleming this time, Cornelius van den Steen, better known under the latinized form of his name Cornelius a Lapide, composed the first complete Commentary on the whole Bible (with the exception of the Psalms and Job) in ten folio volumes. He was born in 1567 in the district of Liége and died in Rome in 1637, after having taught at Louvain and in the *Collegium Romanum*. His work supplied preachers with a wealth of different moral lessons to be derived from Holy Scripture, in accordance with the doctrine of the Fathers, for the edification of the faithful. Cornelius, however, is sometimes wanting in accuracy and is too apt to have recourse to allegorical interpretation.¹

¹ It was Cornelius a Lapide who received the Scots martyr, John Ogilvie, S.J., lately (December 1929) beatified, into the Church from the Calvinism in which his father Walter had bred him. The boy had been sent to the Continent in 1592 at the age of little more than thirteen, and Cornelius, who was professing Holy Scripture in Louvain in 1596, refers to him in his Commentary on Isaiah as ‘a martyr in Scotland, at one time my catechumen at Louvain and lately of our Society’. Ogilvie landed in Scotland in the autumn of 1613, he was hanged (after torture, of course) at the Cross of Glasgow on the 28th February 1615. He was offered his life at the foot of the gallows if he would apostatize but he refused the offer. Cf. Fr W E Brown’s *John Ogilvie*, London, 1925.

One of the most distinguished apologists of the time was a secular priest, Stanislas Hosius. He was born in Cracow, in 1504, of German parentage, but became through the accidents of birth, education, adolescence, and the greater part of his active life, one of the glories of Poland. He was ordained priest in 1543, consecrated bishop of Kulm in 1549 and of Ermland in 1551. He was the leader of the Polish campaign against the invasion of Protestantism at the Synod of Piotrkow in 1552, took an active part as legate in the work of the Council of Trent, was raised to the purple by Pope Pius IV in 1561, and appointed Papal legate in Poland to enforce the decrees of the Council. Recalled to Rome under Gregory XIII, he died at Caprarola in the Campagna in 1579.

The name of Hosius naturally recalls that of Peter Canisius, who also discharged an important mission to Poland and is to be reckoned, as has been already said, among the ablest Catholic apologists of the sixteenth century.

Thomas Stapleton (1535-98), a scholar of Winchester and fellow of New College, Oxford, claims a passing notice in quite a different field. He had been deprived of his prebend in Chichester Cathedral for refusing to abjure the authority of the Pope and acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of Queen Elizabeth, and had retired to Louvain in 1563. Philip II of Spain had founded at Douai, then a town in the Spanish Netherlands, a university specially intended to combat the spread of the new doctrine. Several of the Catholic refugees from England found their way to the university of Douai. Its first chancellor was Dr. Richard Smith, formerly a fellow of Merton and Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Here in 1568 Dr. William Allen, M.A., of Oxford and fellow of Oriel, founded a college, the first of the English 'seminaries' on the Continent. Nine years before, in 1559, the legislation of Elizabeth's first Parliament had repealed the Marian laws that had reunited England with the Holy See and had enacted that the Mass should be abolished and the services of Cranmer's 'Prayer Book' be used in all the churches of England. The Mass was under a ban. Many of the Marian priests had conformed. As for those who, despite the

new laws, still ministered to the Catholics, death was each year thinning their ranks and it was impossible to train and ordain in England itself priests to replace them. Allen's foundation at Douai was not only to provide priests for England, but also to be a centre for producing books of instruction, devotion, and controversy.

Stapleton was a valuable recruit for the college. He accepted Allen's invitation to become one of its professors about 1569. There he composed his *Methodical Demonstration of the Principal Doctrines of the Faith*,¹ printed in French at Paris in 1578, and later published a very useful summary of it. He left Douai in 1576 and, after spending a period in the Noviciate of the Belgian province of the Society of Jesus, was appointed by Philip II to a professorial chair at Louvain, in succession to the chancellor, the famous Michel de Bay, better known as Baius (1513-89), whom he had strenuously opposed for having given currency to a kind of semi-Lutheranism by his doctrine on original sin and justification. Stapleton died at Louvain, on the 12th October 1598, and was buried in the church of St Peter. His *Vere Admiranda seu de magnitudine Romanae Ecclesiae Libri duo* (Antwerp, 1599) and his biography of Blessed Thomas More, interweaving with Roper's simple narrative of the martyred chancellor's life passages from his correspondence, the letters of his friends, and the writings of his contemporaries in *Tres Thomae* (Douai, 1588), may still be profitably consulted.²

Stapleton had translated into English besides *The History of the Church of Englande, Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman* (Antwerp, 1565), the Latin apologetic writings³ of the German, Frederick Staphylus, a convert from Lutheranism and formerly professor of Protestant theology in the university of Konigsberg,

¹ *Principiorum Fidei doctrinalium Demonstratio methodica, per controversias septem in libris duodecim tradita* a thirteenth book was added in 1582.

² The other two Thomases are St Thomas the Apostle and St Thomas of Canterbury.

³ This was published at Antwerp in 1565, under the title of an *Apologie, intreating of the true and right understanding of holy Scripture* with an Appendix of Stapleton's own composition, *Upon the doctrine of the Protestants whch (the Translatour) trieth by the first three founders and fathers thereof, Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, and especially John Calvin.*

who had returned to Catholicism in disgust with the doctrinal anarchy of Lutheranism Staphylus was an intimate friend of Peter Canisius and highly esteemed by Cardinal Hosius, but unfortunately died at an early age at Ingolstadt in 1564.

The two masters of controversy at the time were, however, the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine and the French cardinal Jacques David Du Perron.

St Robert Bellarmine¹ was born at Montepulciano, near Siena, on the 4th October 1542, the third of twelve children. He was, through his mother, Cinthia Cervini, a nephew of Pope Marcellus II. Of a lively disposition and poetic temperament, he combined a sensitive heart with exceptional force of intellect. He was educated by the Jesuits at Montepulciano, and joining the Society in 1559, studied philosophy at the *Collegium Romanum*, was professor of the humanities at Florence and rhetoric at Mondovi in Piedmont, took the theological course at Padua, whence he proceeded to Louvain (1570), and in the intervals of teaching theology preached to the students of the university. He attracted attention everywhere by his talent, the delicacy and fire of his eloquence, and his facility as a versifier. He was ordained priest in Ghent by Bishop Jansen, the uncle of the more famous Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, and the pioneer of Jansenism, and was soon summoned to Rome (1576) to occupy the chair of Controversial Theology recently established in the *Collegium Romanum*. He then produced the great work which constitutes his title to fame *Disputationes de Controversis Christianae Fidei adversus hujus temporis Haereticos* (3 vols., Ingolstadt, 1586-9), the most effective refutation ever made of Protestantism. Lucid, learned, temperate in statement, consistently courteous and respectful towards opponents, it has been frequently republished. Most Protestant writers of the sixteenth century have attempted to answer it. In 1588 William Whitaker, Master of St John's College and Regius Professor of Divinity in the university of Cambridge, the most eminent theologian of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, dedicated to William

¹ The biography in two volumes by Fr James Brodrick, S.J., London, 1928, is of the first importance.

Cecil, Lord Burghley, lord high treasurer of England, a *Disputation concerning Holy Scripture, against the Papists of our time, more particularly Robert Bellarmine and Thomas Stapleton.* From that time onward Whitaker, of whom it was said that he produced a book and a baby—*librum et liberum*—once a year, prided himself on being the special opponent of the famous Jesuit. Oxford also had its 'official refuter' of Bellarmine, in the person of John Rainolds or Reynolds, President of Corpus Christi College, concerning whom an old historian relates the anecdote of two brothers, one Catholic and the other Protestant, who as the result of a lively discussion changed sides, the Protestant becoming a Catholic and the Catholic a Protestant.¹ It was from this arsenal of the *Controversies* that St Francis of Sales, the apostle of the Chablais, some years later drew the substance of the 'Placards' or tracts he broadcasted against the Calvinists

Bellarmino was also involved in the history of France. He was in Paris as theologian to the Papal legate when the city was besieged by Henry IV. To the question 'Would Parisians run the risk of excommunication if they submitted to the King of Navarre?' the Jesuit returned the categorical answer, 'No.' He was not forgotten later by the grateful Henry IV. He was as opposed to the theory of the divine right of kings as to the doctrine of the Pope's direct authority in temporal matters, and had famous discussions on the subject both with Pope Sixtus V and James I of England, who prided himself on his theological learning. Bellarmine, after his death, was always regarded as their enemy by Gallicans, Jansenists, and Josephists of all varieties, so that his process of beatification was not finally successful until the 13th May 1923, nor of canonization till 1932. He retired from his labours to prepare himself for death in the novitiate house of his Society in Rome, and death came to relieve him on the 17th September 1621. Whenever he went his way

¹ The story is told by Fuller of John's brother, William, but on the face of it seems nonsense. William was a scholar of Winchester and fellow of New College, who was received into the Church in Rome in 1575. He lectured in Douai and in the English college at Rheims, where he collaborated in the work of preparing the Rheims version of the New Testament. He died and was buried in Antwerp in 1594.

in the streets of Rome or walked in procession at pontifical functions, the people pointed to him saying *Ecco il santo!*

Jacques David, the future Cardinal Duperron, although educated in Switzerland, was born at Saint-Lô in the Manche in 1566. His father was a doctor who had fled to Genoa, there to become a Calvinist minister. The son returned to France in 1577 or 1578 and was appointed Reader to the King, Henry III. He delivered the funeral orations for Ronsard at the Collège de Boncourt in 1586 and for Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1587, and acquired a considerable reputation for his knowledge of Protestant objections and the method of disposing of them. He was one of those who rallied to the court of Henry of Navarre on the morrow of the death of Henry III, and he was rewarded in 1591 with a promise of the bishopric of Évreux. With the firm confidence that his future was assured he devoted all his energy to the conversion of Henry IV, and rendered the greatest service to his country and the Church. He took part in the famous Conference of St Denis on the 22nd July 1593. From July to September 1595 he was associated with the patient diplomat Cardinal Armand d'Ossat (1537–1604) in the conduct of the negotiations in Rome which ended in the reconciliation of the King and the Holy See. He was rewarded with the title of First Chaplain to the King and Counsellor of State. He was as eloquent as he was learned and won many victories over such Protestants as accepted the challenge to debate with him. A great Disputation was held at Fontainebleau in the King's presence on the 4th May 1600 between Duperion and Duplessis-Mornay, who was called 'the Pope of the Huguenots'. Duperron proved that the quotations made by his opponent in a work directed against the dogma of the Eucharist were largely faked. Duplessis was covered with confusion, professed to be unwell, and disappeared. Henry IV drew the logical conclusion from the debate by observing: 'The diocese of Évreux has conquered the diocese of Saumur' (Duplessis was governor of Saumur, a Protestant fortified town) 'and the mildness of the victory prevents any Huguenot from declaring that anything can be more forcible than truth.'

Duperron was raised to the purple in 1604 and consecrated archbishop of Sens in 1606. He died in Paris on the 5th September 1618.

The art of controversy which, thanks to the Jesuit colleges, was diffused very nearly everywhere, enabled the Catholics not only to repel the Protestant onslaughts but to counter-attack. Most of the eminent ecclesiastical personages of the time distinguished themselves as apologists of the faith and prepared the way for the masterful influence of such as Bossuet.

4. THE MYSTICAL WRITERS

The sixteenth century may be accounted among the greatest in the history of Catholic mysticism. It opened with a golden book, the *Spiritual Exercises* of St Ignatius; it closed with Lorenzo Scupoli's *Spiritual Combat*, to be followed shortly by the *Introduction to the Devout Life* of St Francis of Sales. It included mystical writers of the first rank—St. John of the Cross,¹ St Peter of Alcantara, Luis of Granada, and, most illustrious of all, St Theresa. An attempt has recently been made to classify the mystical tendencies of the time, and with special reference to national character, to distinguish Italian, Spanish, and French (early seventeenth-century) forms of mysticism. The influence of race in a matter so peculiarly subjective is not to be denied, but it would seem hazardous to put forward such a factor as a main basis for a classification. Mystical writers may, perhaps, be more properly divided according to the method of their own practice into *active*, *passive*, and *active passive*.

Such descriptions, however, are in truth largely artificial. Catholic doctrine essentially presupposes the collaboration of the human will with divine grace. This differentiates it from the Protestant doctrine which denies everything in man, so as to attribute to God alone the whole of the spiritual work accomplished in us.

But whereas one mystical writer may tend to stress the collaboration with which the will ought to assist the operation

¹ A model biography by Père Bruno, a Carmelite, has just been published in Paris (December 1929), with a preface by Jacques Maritain.

of grace, another will devote all his energies to denouncing the obstacles which that same will is capable of opposing to the intervention of God and try to induce in it a kind of total deliberate passivity which is, however, exceedingly active.

With this reservation, the *Exercises* of St. Ignatius may be described as the Code of the *active method*. The very title proves it. They make a constant appeal to the will. The subject must act as though grace did nothing at all and pray as though it did everything. The necessary starting-point is the principle that grace never fails the good will, whereas the will often runs the risk of failing grace. It is of the first importance, therefore, to give the human will the impulse which will incline it to a continuous obedience to the promptings of grace. The essential thing is *to have the will*. The saints are men of *will*. Mystics of the most diverse races may easily be attached to this school: a Spaniard like St. Ignatius, Italians such as St. Cajetan, Philip Neri, and Charles Borromeo, a Frenchman like St. Vincent de Paul, and a Savoyard like St. Francis of Sales.

The masters of the *passive method* do not deny the elementary truths here stated. They concentrate their attention, however, on the part played by divine intervention in the work of sanctification. They are specially struck by the more or less conscious resistance which the majority of men set up against such influence. They would teach us to allow God to act in us. Their passive method is not therefore a method of inactivity of the human will. On the contrary, our will tears itself violently away from the temptations of the senses and the attractions of the world to place itself passively under the control of divine grace which knows the goal to lead us to, in other words, produces in us the darkness of *night*—the dark night, as St. John of the Cross called it—of the senses, so that thenceforth we receive only the illumination of the divine sun. St. John of the Cross (1542–91) is the principal representative of such a method. His best-known works are, *The Ascent to Carmel*, *The Dark Night of the Soul*, *The Bright Flame of Divine Love*, and *The Spiritual Canticles*.

It is the glory of St. Theresa (1515–82) that she perceived a means of reconciling the two tendencies and proclaimed the

active passive method which seems to combine harmoniously the two chief characteristics of the preceding methods Prayer, St. Theresa considers, is the gauge of the degree of sanctity. Now the prayers of beginners are above all active, a watering, as it were, 'with water drawn from the well by dint of using one's arms'.

It is important to understand clearly the meanings of the two phrases—the dark night of the senses, and the dark night of the soul. The dark night of the senses is the condition of the soul which has purged itself of all sensual desires and is waiting to receive the will of God with which it is now in a state to co-operate. The dark night of the soul describes a stage through which all mystics have had to pass, in which the soul feels itself to be deserted by God.

The human effort gradually gives way to divine intervention. Prayer becomes more and more passive. It is as though the garden were being watered 'with a noria', or rather, 'by having the water come from a river or stream', or again in the higher degree, as though God Himself were doing the watering 'in a shower of rain'.¹ Our will thus seems to become a mere instrument in the hands of God, whereas in reality it has never been more vigorous and active. St Theresa's principal work is the *Castillo Interior—The Interior Castle* (1577), in which she compares the soul to a great castle with many mansions representing the degrees of perfection. She reckons seven principal mansions, of which the first three (believing souls, good Christians, devout souls, in our present terminology) belong to the active method, whereas the remaining four (fervent souls, saintly souls, heroic souls, great saints) are passive.

The saint's analysis has become classical. Never before had such a flood of light been thrown on the mysteries of spiritual growth and development. The great progress achieved at the time was the study of the varieties and degrees of prayer, the introduction of methodic meditation into every ordered Christian life. It was the ardent desire of St Francis of Sales to have such meditation penetrate even secular society.

¹ Teresa de Jesus, *Libro de su Vida*, cap. xi

Such were some of the energies and activities that were now giving a new vitality to the Catholic Church, and deeply influenced the course of events in the second half of the century that had opened with the revolt of Luther. The reaction not only made good the ground that had been held in earlier years, but won back more than half of what had been lost. As Macaulay says

The history of the two succeeding generations is the history of the struggle between Protestantism possessed of the North of Europe and Catholicism possessed of the South, for the doubtful territory which lay between. At first the chances seemed to be decidedly in favour of Protestantism, but the victory remained with the Church of Rome. On every point she was successful.

PART III

THE DRAWN BATTLE

CHAPTER I

THE CONDITION OF GERMANY AT THE TIME OF THE THIRTY YEARS WAR

EVEN before the outbreak of the Thirty Years War very curious changes had begun to make themselves evident in the social and moral life of Germany. Where the Protestant cause had been successful, one result of success had been the transference to the State of those inquisitorial powers which in a Catholic country would be exercised by the Church. The German of the seventeenth century had therefore to accustom himself to more minute interferences by the State with his private life than had previously been the case, and the early years of the seventeenth century had been marked by a vigorous persecution by the State of all those whom a very wide interpretation of all the old Papal definitions could succeed in proving guilty of magic or witchcraft. Such persecution was found in almost every part of Germany, but most virulently in the Middle Rhineland, in Brunswick, and Franconia. At the same time the superstition of governors kept full pace with the superstition of the governed, and such princes as Christian of Denmark and John Frederick of Weimar boasted themselves to be the recipients of visions and illuminations as peculiar and as improbable as any for which poorer people suffered the ultimate penalty. The belief in astrology, prevalent in the Middle Ages and the sixteenth century, had increased rather than decreased with the confusion of the times.

Side by side with the growth of superstition was to be found, even before the outbreak of the war, a general decline in prosperity. The population had certainly ceased to increase, and perhaps decline had already set in. The collapse of the old medieval system of the 'fixed price' had led to speculation, 'cornering' of markets, and chaotic fluctuation of prices—a

condition which was made even worse by the general debasement of the coinage. In 1603 the Diet had to allow the Turkish aid to be paid in foreign coin, so completely had all German coinage lost its value. Such was the state of affairs that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that it was a question which would devastate Germany first—the social war or the religious—and that the religious only narrowly won.

Though on the whole prosperity was on the decline, yet among the upper and middle classes intemperance in food and drink and in dress was quite extraordinarily prevalent. Borrowing from the Jews was even more common in the seventeenth century than it had been in the sixteenth. Foreign trade, home trade, manufacture, and mineral output were all declining. The Hanseatic League, which 200 years before had played so proud a part in the general system of Europe, was in decay and almost in dissolution, and Scandinavians, Dutch, and English had captured trade which had previously been in the hands of merchants of Danzig or Hamburg or Lubeck.

The troubles had then already begun before the outbreak of the Thirty Years War. Yet it is, of course, a commonplace that by the course of the war all those troubles were appallingly aggravated. If we pass on to the year 1648, it is an almost incredible picture of misery which the records show to us.

It has been noted how, in earlier generations, whatever the trouble in commercial Germany, the country districts had preserved a vigorous and stable agricultural life, not too closely anxious about the political, social, or religious disturbances of the time. The Thirty Years War very ruthlessly brought to an end this careless prosperity. There was hardly a part of the country which had not been again and again in the occupation of troops, who, whether technically classed as friend or foe, in either case lived unsparingly on the country and left behind them a trail of crops destroyed, cattle stolen, and farmhouses burnt and pillaged. What had been a countryside was now little more than a desert.

The war had broken out in Bohemia, and in that kingdom it is said that by 1648 only 6,000 villages out of a previous

35,000 survived at all. Moravia and Silesia had similar tales to tell Austria Proper fared slightly better owing to the Emperor's policy of keeping the war out of his own hereditary dominions, but there is no other part of the Empire—not the Rhineland nor Bavaria nor the central districts, nor even Brunswick nor Brandenburg nor Frisia in the north—that in any way escaped the scourge of war. Some suffered at the hands of this commander, some of that. The result was in all cases much the same and so appalling as to be almost incredible.

Although it is said that 350,000 actually fell in battle, yet the destruction of battle was, as often happens, the least of war's calamities. Famine and plague, following in the train of devastation, destroyed many more than the sword. It is hard to be certain of the accuracy of statistics, but the most competent judges estimate that between 1618 and 1648 the population of the Empire sank from 16 million to 6 million. In the Lower Palatinate it is sometimes said that only 1 in 50, and seems to be true that only 1 in 10, survived, in Wurttemberg 1 in 6, in Bohemia 1 in 4.

In spite of the terrible suffering of the peasantry, governments in their desperate need of money could not and would not relax any of their claim to taxation. Indeed they added new burdens, and where dues could not be paid in money, they had to be paid in forced labour. The result was the reintroduction of serfdom, from which the peasantry had been entirely free before the Reformation troubles, and of serfdom of a particularly onerous and one-sided type, for the prince could not guarantee to the serf that security of tenure which at least serfdom usually brings with it, nor defend him effectively against the attack of marauding bands, with which the mercenary conditions of the war had made Germany full.

As a result large tracts of land which had previously been under the plough were now forest again, and wolves and wild beasts were found where had been villages and flourishing peasants. A third of the land of northern Germany, it was estimated, remained uncultivated for a generation after the conclusion of the war. Products of the land decreased extra-

ordinarily or passed out of use altogether. Prices fell—in Saxony, for instance, to about half what they had been before the war—and agriculture only recovered slowly in the most fortunate districts and only recovered at all in those lucky and infrequent places which happened in the years after Westphalia to be blessed with the rule of an intelligent prince.

The inhabitants of the towns suffered only less than those of the country. The population of the towns, it was estimated, declined in a ratio less by one-third than that of the country. The town was, of course, better protected than the farm, and the rich townsman had facilities for investing his capital outside the country altogether. On the other hand, the looting of a town, when it did take place, was often more thorough than the devastation of a countryside, which came to be looked upon as little more than the everyday business of a mercenary soldier to be casually performed. The standard of living of the towns depended upon the complexities of trade, and the cutting of a trade-route might mean starvation. It was of little advantage to be the possessor of large investments in England or in France, if all means of communication with those countries were blocked by hostile armies. The drain of man-power for the wars also brought about a great decline in the production of manufactured goods.

Almost the only places in Germany which altogether escaped the devastation of war were the three Hanseatic ports of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lubeck. As has been said, even before the war the Hanseatic League had seen the last of its days of glory and the chances of the war had put Wismar into the hands of the Swedes and Danzig into those of Poland. Bremen, Hamburg, and Lubeck alone remained. They kept themselves aloof from the war, and behind their neutral walls refugees from the rest of Germany found welcome protection, so that, while the population of other places was declining, that of these towns increased. Yet there was no increase of trade to keep pace with the increase of population, Lubeck in particular suffering disastrously from the establishment of Swedish control over the western Pomeranian coast. Also, though neutrality was

better than devastation, it could only be preserved by the diversion of large sums of money from commercial investment to works of defence

Of the inland commercial towns there was not one which did not suffer. Those of central Germany fell lowest. In the Rhine-land, Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle sank into complete insignificance, from which they did not emerge for many years, other towns fared better by turning their eyes away from derelict and chaotic Germany and attaching themselves to the commercial life of the more prosperous Dutch. Previously the balance of trade between Germany and France had been in the German favour. Germany had now little to export, and the balance was heavily with France.

Every manufacturing industry, cloth, linen, wool, glass, pottery, suffered heavily from the disturbances of the times and from the lack of both capital and labour. The mines of Silesia and Bohemia were largely deserted and left un-worked.

As has been shown elsewhere, the result of the Treaty of Westphalia was to reduce imperial control over the princes to a minimum. Each prince was therefore the master of his own fiscal and commercial policy. It is not possible to inquire into the policy of every one in detail, and generalizations are apt to be unfair, but it is not unjust to say that the policy of the princes, who imposed upon their subjects innumerable petty regulations and tariffs, was not only selfish, but also short-sighted. It retarded that recovery of Germany with which even the personal prosperity of the princes was in reality bound up. Germany, unable to supply her own needs, became the field of foreign commercial exploitation. The Dutch, the commercial nation, and the French, whom prestige recognized as the leaders of civilization, competed with one another for the commercial mastery of Germany.

The Thirty Years War had been a civil war and had brought with it every one of those horrors which make civil war peculiarly detestable. Piled on top of the horrors of civil war came the horrors of foreign invasion. At one time and another during

the war Germany had suffered invasion from nations the most various and on almost every frontier—from the Swedes and the Poles, the French and the Spaniards, and from the wild and barbarous hordes of the south-eastern corners of the Habsburg dominions. The war, too, very early became, and continued until the end, a mercenary war. The revolt against imperial authority and the evil teaching which allowed to the prince the power over the consciences of his subjects produced that species of petty German princeling, ruling his little territory with irresponsible and selfish incompetence, the most despicable, perhaps, of any class whom the inscrutable purposes of Providence have ever allowed to exercise dominion over his fellow man.

It is the tendency of an unsettled condition of life, in which no man can ever tell if each day may not be his last, to make many converts to the philosophy of *Carpe diem* and 'Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die'. There is not a feature which Thucydides noted in the life of plague-stricken Athens two thousand years ago which could not be paralleled in the life of a poor German town of the seventeenth century, and in the midst of plague and famine were found exhibitions of gigantic drunkenness and Gargantuan overeating and of the most grotesque and extravagant displays of clothes. The old, smiling, quiet, orderly, prosperous, perhaps slightly prim life of the German burgher perished completely, and the housewife, who had been proverbial for propriety throughout all Europe, was now dragged about at the tail of mercenary soldiers, half a prostitute and half a gipsy.

As to religion, the war dealt the genuine Protestant piety a blow from which it has never recovered. Protestantism hardly survived at all, and only survived by ceasing to be a religion and becoming instead a political programme. In the years since Westphalia the Protestant part of Germany has given birth to many great men—to Goethe and Schiller and Kant, to Stein and Humboldt, but differing in all else, these men have been alike in this one thing, they have none of them been Protestants in the sense in which Luther or Calvin were

Protestants The true Catholic spirit suffered a blow only less serious because the Catholic Faith possessed the means of preventing such wounds from being irreparable. Literature, education, genuine philosophical speculation were almost at a standstill. The village schools were almost entirely obliterated by the war, and, when it was at last over, the duke of Wurtemburg alone among German princes paid any notable attention to the rebuilding of the country's educational system. The Jesuits, almost alone, fought a battle to prevent the complete relapse of the country into barbarism. Among non-Catholic Germans who interested themselves in education there is hardly a name that can be quoted save that of the Moravian Amos Comenius. The universities even before the war had sunk to a low level, and after the Treaty of Westphalia such was the barbarism of student manners that in 1565 the Diet of the Empire had to issue an Ordinance against them. In literature the names of two satirists, von Grimmelshausen and Moscherosch, do something to redeem the barrenness of the age, but, while redeeming, they at the same time bore witness to that barrenness and had no remedy to offer. On the other hand, people took refuge from terror and irreligion in the most savage persecution. The witch-burnings, to which reference has already been made, increased terribly. In the years 1627 and 1628, for instance, the bishop of Wurzburg is said to have burnt as many as 9,000, and in 1640 and 1641 a thousand were burnt in the single Silesian principality of Neisse.

History has record of few times more horrid than those of the Thirty Years War, and on the generality of man the effect of such conditions of life is brutalizing and bad. Yet sufferings before which the normal man and woman succumb do but serve as opportunities for virtue for the rarest and noblest. It would have been strange had none such been found in seventeenth-century Germany, and there are a few noble names, Catholic and non-Catholic, to relieve the squalor and horror of the general picture. Of these the most notable was undoubtedly the Jesuit, Friedrich von Spee. Father von Spee is the possessor of an honourable place in the roll of German

religious poets, but he is more noteworthy for his *Cautio Criminis*, in which he attacked the unfairness of the savage witch-trials of his day, and raised in an age of unspeakable barbarism what was almost a solitary voice, pleading for humanity and mercy.

CHAPTER II

THE WARS OF RELIGION IN FRANCE

Summary 1 The political advent of Calvinism in France 2 The organization of the Protestants 3 The first three Wars and the Massacre of St Bartholomew 4 From the Edict of Beaulieu to the Edict of Nemours. 5 From the Edict of Nemours to the Edict of Nantes (1585-98) 6 The Edict of Nantes

I. THE POLITICAL ADVENT OF CALVINISM IN FRANCE

IN Germany Lutheranism had rapidly become a political factor of the first importance. It had from the beginning received the protection and patronage of the towns and the princes and was therefore able to develop swiftly into a State Church. It had simultaneously shrunk and solidified in the process, so that it became finally ineradicable. Its career in France had not been nearly so successful. There it had come into collision and vainly attempted to coalesce with the powerful reforming movement which had been inaugurated at Meaux,¹ while it was faced at the same time with an almost insurmountable barrier in the open and avowed opposition of the Sorbonne, fortified with the support of Parliament and the backing of the royal authority. The Sorbonne, however, while strongly opposed to the Lutheran doctrines, at the same time greatly hampered the effective countering of them by its opposition to the Jesuits. Francis I, too, was in his early years affected by the sceptical tendencies of the Renaissance and thought to prove the breadth of his mind by his encouragement of Lutherans, particularly in the university. He was also doubtless persuaded to a policy of indulgence by his sister Margaret, queen of Navarre, and he imperilled Catholic interests by his selfish foreign policy of seeking for allies against the Emperor among the Protestant princes of Germany. But the provocative harangue delivered by Nicholas Cop, the new rector of the university of Paris, on the 1st November 1533, in which he unmistakably committed himself to the doctrine of Justification by Faith, still more the affair of the Placards, when the citizens

¹ See *supra*, p. 102, for an account of this movement and its sequel

of Paris and Orleans woke up on the morning of the 18th October 1534 to find the walls of their cities placarded with a coarse, violent, and blasphemous diatribe against the Mass, and when one of the Placaids was even affixed to the door of the King's bedchamber at Amboise, were acts of fanaticism which inflamed the King to a fierce reaction against the disturbers of the peace. Francis I had since then shown himself, amid national chaps and changes of policy, on the whole hostile to Protestant pretensions. His clear perception of the disruptive force of the new doctrines caused him later to favour them abroad, and energetically to repress them at home. The Concordat of 1516, on the other hand, which was substituted for the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438, to which the Popes had always refused their assent, by giving the king the right of appointment to the more important benefices (some six hundred bishoprics and abbeys), placed all ecclesiastical property under his control. He had slightly less reason, therefore, than other princes to break with Rome and enrich himself with the spoil of the Church.

The slaughter of the Waldenses in April 1545 at Merindol and Cabrières must therefore be attributed, in spite of everything, rather to local fanaticism¹ than to any general religious policy of the king. Their customs and tenets were so strange that it was difficult for normal people to live at peace with them and their whole history had therefore been a stormy one. On this occasion about eight hundred persons are said to have lost their lives, to the alarm of Francis himself. He caused an inquiry to be made which resulted in the exemplary punishment of the guilty parties in the following reign.

The form of Protestant doctrine which found favour in France was not the Lutheran but the Calvinist, and by about the end of Francis's reign 'Calvinist' had become the term by which

¹ Another massacre in 1655, this time of the Savoyard Waldenses, was the occasion of Milton's sonnet. *Avenge, O Lord, Thy slaughtered Saints, &c.*, but the 'slaughtered saints', long tolerated in the exercise of their eccentric rites, provided that they kept to themselves, on that occasion had expropriated the lands of their neighbours, refused to leave the land they had seized, and aggravated their offence by calling in to help them fellow Protestants from across the border, with the not unnatural result of compelling the duke of Savoy to take strong measures against them as rebels.

Protestants were normally designated. Under Henry II, who succeeded to his father in 1547, the suppression of the new doctrines became both more systematic and more rigorous. Edict followed edict against the dissenters: an edict of the 8th October 1547 instituted the *Chambre Ardente* for the trial of heretics, another of the 19th November 1549 amplified and aggravated the edict of 1547, an edict issued from Châteaubriant on the 27th June 1551 decreed that no appeal was to lie from the judgements pronounced by the *Chambre*, another from Compiègne under date the 24th July 1557, reciting the inefficacy of former measures, renewed and aggravated them still further by establishing in France a tribunal of the Inquisition, which had long been actively at work in Spain.¹

Calvinism, however, continued to make rapid progress in France. In 1555 the first steps were taken towards giving to its adherents what they had hitherto lacked, a regular organization. A powerful offensive was launched from Geneva under Calvin's direction, and Protestant churches sprang up in that same year at Paris, Meaux, Angers, Poitiers, Loudun in the Vienne, and in the Arvert peninsula in the lower Charente, in 1556 at Bourges, Aubigny, Blois, Tours, and Montargis, in 1557 at Orléans, Sens, Dieppe, and Rouen, in 1558 at Troyes, La Rochelle, Le Croisic, Saintes, Saint-Jean-d'Angely, Marennes, Cognac, Toulouse, Villefranche, and Nérac in the Lot-et-Garonne. In the beginning of 1559 the campaign was waged with still greater intensity. The pastor Maçon, who had taken up his head-quarters in Paris, wrote to Calvin in 1558 that 'the fire is kindled in every part of the realm and all the water in the ocean will not avail to put it out'.² In May 1559 Tiepolo, the Venetian ambassador, reported that the cardinal of Lorraine admitted that the heresy had invaded *two-thirds* of the kingdom. Such an enormous exaggeration can only be explained by the fact that the court looked upon every malcontent as a heretic. Protestant authorities are not so positive. They at any rate were

¹ Previous to this there had been no regular Inquisition in France, but visiting Inquisitions had from time to time held special commissions.

² Cf. *Opera Calvinii*, viii 162, Maçon to Calvin, letter dated the 9th May 1558.

able to distinguish between those who had abandoned Catholicism in disgust with the king's policy or on critical grounds, in a word, the malcontents, and the true disciples of the Calvinist Gospel, the 'Saints'. They reckoned according to their own statistics¹ 2,150 churches in France in 1560, some of considerable importance—Rouen, for example, had a congregation of 10,000. There was never more than one in the same locality, and their entire following amounted to 3,000,000 souls in a total population of 20,000,000. say 15 per cent.

There was, however, a more important factor. Calvinists or Lutherans were numerous in the army, and the bankers of Lyons, the mainstay of French finance, were as a rule great patrons of Calvinism.

These were the principal reasons which determined the king's hasty signature of the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (2nd April 1559). Events of importance had, however, occurred before to confirm and intensify the king's hostile attitude to the Calvinist invasion. Protestantism until then had drawn its recruits mostly from the lower classes of the population. But from 1557 onwards, the nobility poured into the Calvinist movement. A conventicle of Calvinists was discovered in the rue Saint-Jacques in Paris on the 5th September 1557, and 'there were present', writes Pasquier, 'any number of nobles, both ladies and gentlemen'. On the 13th May 1558 the Paris Calvinists had the hardihood to hold a public meeting, when three or four thousand, according to some accounts, six or seven thousand according to others, assembled. For five successive evenings they sang Clement Marot's *Psalms* according to the Genevan rite in the Pré-aux-Clercs and returned to their home when darkness fell, psalm-singing as they went. On Monday, the 16th, Antoine de Bourbon, titular king of Navarre and first prince of the Blood, took part in the procession and the psalm-singing. All non-Protestant accounts declare that the nobles were armed, a virtual declaration of war according to the custom of the time. Riots broke out between the police of the capital and the demonstrators. The king learned about the same time that François

¹ Cf. the Calvinist *Bulletin du Diaconat* for 1919.

d'Andelot, of the Châtillon family, the brother of Coligny and nephew of Montmorency, one of his best captains and a great noble, had become converted to the new doctrines. Henry II, already furious, was seized with a panic fear that he might lose his crown.

Treachery in his view was rampant everywhere, and his anxieties found a focus on one point, the hatred of heresy. He had d'Andelot brought before him on the 18th May, vigorously expostulated with the convert, and, on d'Andelot's refusal to abjure his Calvinist opinions, ordered him to be placed under arrest and thrown into prison.

So summary a proceeding caused a sensation in the army. The Catholics themselves in a spirit of military comradeship sided with the prisoner. It was the first time that a man of his rank had been so treated, and means were found to obtain a form of retraction from d'Andelot so that it should be possible to pardon him.

It is certain that, if Henry II had lived, France would have witnessed a pitiless persecution of Calvinists. The arrest in open session of Parliament, on the 10th June 1559, of the Counsellor Anne du Bourg and a number of other secretly Calvinist magistrates, the ordinances of the drastic edict of Écouen of the 2nd June 1559, the King's last decree against heresy, all indicate that the suppression would have been carried out with the utmost rigour. But a month after the arrest of du Bourg, Henry was mortally wounded on the 29th June at jousts in the Tournelles held in honour of the approaching marriage of Philip of Spain and Elizabeth of France. The king lingered for ten days in terrible agony and died on the 10th July 1559.

The Protestants considered his death as a judgement of God, the more manifest because the fatal blow above the right eye had been dealt the king by the broken lance of his opponent Gabriel de Montgomery, the captain of his Scots guard, who had been charged with the duty of arresting du Bourg on the 10th June. A rumour spread and came to the ears of d'Aubigné that the king had admitted his error and expressed his regret for having persecuted so many excellent people. But the fact is that

he had still time to write to his ambassador in Rome to tell the Pope that he had every hope of using all his energy 'to punish, chastise, and extirpate all who should be discovered initiating the new doctrines and that he would spare nobody of whatsoever rank or station'

The Catholics were dumbfounded at his death. On the 22nd July 1559 Peter Canisius wrote to Laynez 'It is impossible to describe the grief felt among the Catholics of Augsburg and Bavaria at the sudden death of King Henry.'¹

2. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PROTESTANTS

The French Protestants perfected their organization during the last months of the reign of Henry II, that is to say, while the persecution was at its height. A knowledge of this organization is essential to the understanding of the strength they displayed in the civil wars.

The pastors took the initiative in assembling in Paris, on the 26th May 1559, the first national synod of the French Protestant Church. The outcome of the synod was a *Confession of Faith* and a Rule of Ecclesiastical Discipline. The Confession of Faith (*Confessio Gallicana*) began with an address to the king couched in the most submissive and respectful terms. The sovereign's attention was invited to the evangelical character of the new doctrine—a doctrine definitely opposed to the Papacy 'because the pure truth of God has been ousted thence because the Sacraments (of Popery) are corrupt, bastardized, falsified, or utterly degraded because every kind of superstition and idolatry is rife therein'.

The unit in the Calvinist organization was the *community* or local church. A number of neighbouring churches were grouped as convenience allowed into a *colloquy* and *colloques* into *provinces*. Provinces were to assemble in a synod twice or four times a year.

Delegates from all the *provincial synods* constituted the *national synod*, which was to have been held once a year.

Delegates from all the *provincial synods* thus constituted

¹ Cf. Braunsberger, *B P Canisii Epistulae et Acta*, II, p. 480.

admirable bases for religious taxation and later for military levies.

Every community or local church had its Ministers of the Word, its Elders, and Deacons, who together made up the Consistory Article 24 of the Decree of 1559 prescribed as follows: 'Elders and Deacons are the Senate of the Church and their President shall be selected from the Ministers of the Word The function of the Elders shall be to assemble the congregation, to report any scandals to the Consistory, and such like.'

This organization was confirmed and completed in the national synods held in the following years. Poitiers, 1560; Orléans, 1562; Lyons, 1563; Paris, 1565, Verneuil, 1567, La Rochelle, 1571, and so forth

The first *national synod*, held in 1559, had divided France into sixteen *provinces*. This form of organization, however, lasted only four years, the first civil war having shown its weakness. Some provinces contained too few Protestants. They counted on paper but did not provide such reinforcements in arms as might have been expected. The number of *provinces* was therefore reduced at the synod of Lyons, in 1563, to nine. The sole object contemplated by the authors of the scheme was to achieve the doctrinal and disciplinary unity of the Calvinist Church, but it turned out that they had created an organization which could be most conveniently exploited by political magnates who, having taken part in the reforming movement through love of novelty or discontent or conviction, were determined to use the powerful Calvinist influence to serve their political ends.

The problem of the Wars of Religion is that of seeing how the discontented nobles in the reign of Francis II succeeded in making use of the Calvinist forces.

There is no doubt that Calvin long discountenanced any suggestion of open insurrection. The pastors who carried out his orders in France with the most rigid obedience were, like their general, opposed to any revolt properly so called. But the time came when, under the pressure of what the historian Mariejol very aptly describes as 'the casuistry of rebellion', their mood changed.

The new king, Francis II, was a sickly boy and left the entire conduct of affairs to the Guises, the uncles of his wife, the beautiful Mary Stuart. The Bourbons and the Montmorency-Châtillon group, ousted from power, were consumed with a passion for vengeance upon their rivals. The Calvinist Church of Strasburg, dominated by the influence of the combative and violent jurist, Francis Hotman (1524-90), the author (*inter alia*) of the famous *Letter sent to the Tiger of France*,¹ counselled the use of force as a remedy for the situation of Calvinism in France. Calvin himself hesitated. He was strongly opposed to the scourge of civil war. 'If a single drop of blood were to be shed,' he wrote to Coligny on the 16th April 1561, in a letter condemning the Tumult of Amboise, 'rivers of blood would inundate Europe. It were better that we should all perish a hundred times than be the cause of exposing the fame of Christendom and the Gospel to such a disgrace.' But he admitted having said that 'If the princes of the Blood needed support in their rights for the common good and the courts of Parliament took up their quarrel, it would be lawful for every good subject to give them armed assistance'.²

This was to affirm a conditional right of rebellion. Other bolder casuists were very soon to be satisfied with a single prince of the Blood, such as the prince of Condé, or, later, Henry of Bourbon, and a few Parliamentarians, to sanction an armed insurrection.

The coalition of the 'political Huguenots', as they were described by Régnier de la Planche, a contemporary, and the 'religious Huguenots', was inevitable.³ The political Huguenots,

¹ The Duke of Guise

² Cf J. Bonnet's *Lettres françoises de Jean Calvin* (2 vols), Paris, 1854, vol. II, at p. 384. There is an English translation, *Letters of John Calvin*, I, II, by Constable, Edinburgh, 1855, III, IV, by Gilchrist, Philadelphia, 1858.

³ The word 'Huguenot' began to become current about this very time (1560). According to the opinions of contemporary historians, such as Régnier de la Planche, Davila, La Place, and La Popelinière, the term was derived from the practice of the Protestants of Tours gathering beside a gate called the gate of King Hugo Pasquier, on the other hand, another contemporary, avers that the people of Tours believed in a ghost called King Hugo or Huguet, who gave his name to the Protestants because they held their meetings by night, a derivation which would seem to have come to the ears of Christopher Marlowe, who, in his *Massacre of*

closely considered, were of two kinds the great nobles, such as Bourbon and Châtillon, who were enraged at being excluded from power, and the lesser nobles whose trade was war and who had been ruined by peace They had overwhelmed the government of the Guises with their complaints and grievances, and the cardinal of Lorraine—the Statesman of the family—had refused to listen to them They were fuming with exasperation and filled with hatred of the party for the time being in power Neither class was by nature inclined to the humble resignation which Calvin kept preaching in his letters to the faithful brethren of France. The capital error committed by the Guises was not to have foreseen and prevented the conjunction of their enemies, either by disarming the discontented captains or abandoning proceedings against the Protestants They were intoxicated by the feeling of omnipotence they enjoyed under the aegis of their niece, the triumphant Mary Stuart. The premature death on the 5th December 1560 of Francis II, after a brief reign of seventeen months, gave the enemies he had made, more particularly as a result of the abortive tumult of Amboise, an opportunity to attempt their revenge

The Tumult of Amboise, as it was contemptuously called, was the desperate effort of a few adventurers under the direction of a 'dumb leader' (that is to say, his support of their enterprise was secret), the prince of Condé, the younger brother of Anthony of Bourbon. Condé had been enticed to Orléans by the Guises, arrested, tried, and condemned to death The sudden disappearance from the stage of Francis II and the accession to the throne of Charles IX under the tutelage of Catherine de' Médici, the queen-mother, and Anthony of Bourbon, appointed Lieutenant-General of the Realm (the boy king was only ten years old), gave back his liberty to Condé. While the Guises with Montmorency and Jacques d'Albon de Saint André,

Paris, written after the assassination of Henry III (2nd August 1589), declares

There are a hundred Huguenots and more

Which in the woods do hold their synagogues

Still another suggestion is that the word is a corruption of the German *Eidgenossen*, 'the confederates', the name applied by the adherents of the Duke of Savoy to the Genevese 'Protestants'.

marshal of France, formed a 'triumvirate' for the defence of Catholicism, the Protestants, under cover of Catherine de' Médici's deliberate toleration, made enormous progress. The Colloquy of Poissy (a village on the Seine about three miles west of St. Germain), which lasted from the 9th September to the 15th October 1561, gave them the chance of airing their views and appearing in public on a footing of equality with the representatives of the old religion. Even the ranks of the clergy began to show some sensational defections: the cardinal de Châtillon, the brother of Coligny, and d'Andelot, openly went over to Calvinism, while Antonio Caraccioli, bishop of Troyes, was not ashamed to combine his episcopal dignity with the rank of a Genevan pastor. The Catholics became exasperated at the progress of Calvinism and a reaction set in. The Wars of Religion then began.

3. THE FIRST THREE WARS AND THE MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW

Catherine de' Médici, the queen-regent, by the advice of the Chancellor Michel de l'Hôpital (his part, however, has long been exaggerated, for he was but a docile instrument in the hands of the regent), had conceived the hope of pursuing a see-saw policy between the two contending parties. She quickly realized that any such scheme was impossible. On the 17th January 1562 she had published an edict known as the Edict of January, authorizing the Protestants to hold meetings, but *only outside the towns* and under the supervision of royal officials. The king of Navarre, however, at the instigation of the agents of Philip II, opposed the enforcement of the edict, recalled to court the Guises, who were sulking in their tents, and allied himself with the constable (Montmorency) and Saint-André. On his way back to court on Sunday, the 1st March 1562 (he had been staying at his house of Joinville in the Haute-Marne), the duke of Guise rode into the town of Vassy on the Blaise. Inside the town he found a congregation of Huguenots who, contrary to the law, had assembled together for the purpose of psalm-singing. The duke ordered his troops to disperse them, but

when they attempted to do so, they were met with cries of 'Papists, idolaters'. Stones began to fly, and one struck the duke himself, whereupon the soldiers, losing their heads, fired upon the Huguenot mob, killing, it seems, some sixty of them and wounding many more. It is not possible to defend the conduct of Guise and his followers. At the same time it would be most unfair to pick out this isolated incident from the sixteenth century and judge it by the standards of the twentieth. To the extreme Catholic, as to the extreme Calvinist of the day, any form of worship other than that which he believed to have been ordained by God, was of the devil. If princes bade him tolerate it he did so only with a bad conscience and under protest, and in such an atmosphere collisions of violence at frequent intervals were inevitable. It is best to ascribe the responsibility for these outbreaks to the peculiar temper of the time: to attempt to lay the blame either on the one side or the other is a little futile. As soon as Guise arrived in Paris, Condé, Coligny, d'Andelot, and their partisans took up arms. 'If I am any judge of fighting', wrote Pasquier, 'I would say that it is the beginning of a tragedy which is about to be enacted in our midst at our expense.' Cecil, the minister of Elizabeth of England, saw clearly that the security of his mistress's throne depended very largely on the insecurity of that of her neighbours and encouraged the resistance of the French Protestants in much the same way as the French had encouraged the resistance of the English Protestants in the reign of Elizabeth's sister, Mary. Orléans became the capital of the Reformed party. Paris remained in Catholic hands. In a few weeks' time the whole kingdom was ablaze. Every governor of a province or a town took sides with one or other of the opponents.

(a) *The First War.* The principal feature of the first war was the capture of Rouen from the Huguenots. Anthony of Bourbon was killed in the course of the siege and died unlamented. The two opposing armies met a little later, on the 19th December 1562, at Dreux, a fortified town close to the frontier of Normandy. Condé was defeated and taken prisoner. Saint-André was killed in the mêlée in cold blood by the hand

of a Huguenot noble. The duke of Guise, however, was not left long to enjoy his victory. He was mortally wounded by a shot in the back fired at the siege of Orléans by Jean Poltrot de Méré, a fanatical Huguenot, almost certainly with the connivance of Coligny, and died on the 24th February 1563. Both factions had lost their leaders, and the regent seized the opportunity to restore peace and a treaty was concluded at Amboise on the 19th March 1563.

(b) Poltrot de Méré had formally declared that he was the agent of Coligny. The Guises were not reluctant to believe the charge. The mutual hatred persisted, and the so-called religious war assumed the appearance of a Corsican vendetta. The queen-mother vainly attempted to pursue her policy of mutual toleration. Both sides looked on and remained in arms. Catherine, in the course of a journey through France, happened to meet the duke of Alva at Bayonne in June 1565. Alva had been entrusted with the task of suppressing heresy in the Netherlands. Nothing more was required to convince the Calvinists that an agreement was being negotiated between France and Spain to crush their Church. In short, on St Michael's Day, the 29th September 1567, the Huguenots rose in arms throughout the country, seized a number of towns, and attempted to lay hands on the person of the king.

Charles IX, then a lad of seventeen, was compelled to flee in shame and anger from a subject, the prince of Condé, to avoid capture. Another explosion of fury set the two factions at each other's throats from end to end of the kingdom. History can take account of only the more salient episodes; but to form a true picture of the time it should be borne in mind that local faction fights, innumerable skirmishes and fighting took place throughout the provinces, and the exploits in every part of the country of *condottieri* such as Montluc and Baron des Adrets in the Lyonnais and the Dauphiné, brought slaughter, pillage, and in their turn reprisals of every kind. The great vendetta between the Guises and the Châtillons was complicated and aggravated by innumerable private vendettas. The only notable battle in this second war, a cavalry action, took place on the 19th November

1567 at St Denis, outside the gates of Paris Montmorency won the day, but was killed by a pistol-shot fired by a Scot. He was succeeded in the command by Henry, the young duke of Anjou, a brother of the king and a lad of sixteen, while hostilities were ended by the lame peace of Longjumeau of the 23rd-27th March, 1568.

(c) *The Third War* A feeling of furious exasperation continued to prevail on both sides, with no apparent prospect of any genuine reconciliation between the parties. Coligny and Condé had recourse to arms again on the 21st August 1568. Their friends invoked the help both of the queen of England and the German Protestants. It seemed as though France were about to be torn in pieces. The young king in a fit of rage revoked the January Edict of 1562, and ordered all Protestant ministers to clear out of the country within fifteen days. The first big military engagement was fought at Jarnac in the Charente on the 13th March 1569. Condé was defeated, taken prisoner, and shot in cold blood on the battle-field by the Gascon Montesquiou, captain of the guard of the duke of Anjou, the victor in the struggle. Another memorable battle was fought on the 3rd October 1569 in the neighbourhood of Montcontour on the Dive in Vienne. Coligny, who, according to the account of the Protestants, was only in nominal command on behalf of the two young princes of Bourbon and Condé, was routed by Tavannes, who, under the nominal authority of the duke of Anjou, directed operations. Charles IX, jealous of the laurels won by his brother, resolved to grant a fresh Edict of Pacification by the peace of St-Germain-en-Laye, which was concluded on the 8th August 1570. This treaty contained one novelty—the Huguenots received four fortified towns for a term of two years.

(d) *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew* Coligny had been defeated everywhere during the war but secured many advantages by the peace. The king had now come to regard him as his favourite counsellor. He committed the mistake of inciting the king to war with Spain on behalf of the Netherlands. The queen-mother strenuously opposed it, and the rivalry of

influence between the two rapidly became acute. On the 5th August, the nuncio Salviati reported as follows 'The queen cannot keep her eyes off the admiral's hands, while the admiral, relying on the reputation his success has won for him, is trying to get too much: the queen will rap him over the knuckles if he goes too far . . .' Catherine continued her see-saw policy. She saw clearly enough that public opinion would not much longer tolerate the Huguenot control over French foreign policy. An explosion in which the Huguenots would go down to destruction was certain, and, if at the time of that explosion the monarchy should be found in alliance with the Huguenots, then it was only too likely that the monarchy would share the fate of its ally. She therefore determined to make use of his old enemies, the Guises, to thwart the ambitions of Coligny.

Assassination at the time was a current method in the higher statecraft, and Poltrot's crime inspired a vendetta of the Guises against Coligny. An assassin presented himself to them in the person of a certain Maurevel, a gentleman from Brie, of utterly dissolute character. On Friday, 22nd August, Maurevel fired two shots from an arquebus at the admiral as he was leaving the Louvre. He succeeded only in wounding him. This outrage was destined to be followed by the most appalling consequences. Coligny's friends clamoured for vengeance. The king, who liked him, swore roundly that he would punish the culprit. Catherine was terrified, and to save herself and her friends conceived the frantic idea of provoking a general massacre of Huguenots. She took into her confidence her favourite son, the duke of Anjou, and the duke of Guise, who was burning to avenge his father's death. She dispatched to the king, Albert de Gondi, a favourite of his. De Gondi made a visit to Charles IX on the night of the 23rd August between nine and ten o'clock. He told the King that a mass rising of Huguenots was imminent; he made him terrified for the safety of his crown. The king allowed the desired consent to be wrung from him. So the frightful massacre of the Feast of St Bartholomew was arranged, a lamentable episode in the pitiless vendetta between two families involving the whole kingdom in ruin. A general massacre of

the Huguenots was not premeditated either by the Guises or Catherine de' Médici, still less by the wretched king, who two years later carried with him to the grave the horror and remorse of those blood-stained days.¹

The original plot aimed only at Coligny. But when the news spread that he was wounded, and all Paris was quivering with excitement, the queen determined to take advantage of the intense unpopularity of the Huguenots, who were looked on by the citizens of Paris both as traitors to religion and as responsible for the horrors of civil war with which the country had been afflicted. The day of St Bartholomew was a day of especially bitter memory to Catholic Frenchmen, for on that day three years before the Huguenots at Orthez had set upon and massacred the Catholic garrison. It was therefore appallingly easy for Catherine to ring the tocsin and to spread the panic and alarm that had often roused the factions of Paris to wild deeds. The king's life, it was rumoured, was in danger at the hands of Coligny's adherents; it was then said that Charles had already been assailed by assassins. No further invitation was necessary. Paris rose on the hated Huguenot. Coligny was among the first to be murdered, and soon the movement grew to a strength which Catherine had quite failed to foresee and was quite unable to control. The number of victims estimated by historians varies from 8,000 to 30,000 for the whole of France, for 2,000 to 10,000 for Paris alone, while massacre begat counter-massacre, and the Huguenots, wherever they happened to be in strength, turned on the Catholics. Sir Walter Raleigh, who was in France at the time, speaks of seeing the Catholics smoked out of their caves in the hills of Languedoc.²

After the event efforts were made to spread over Europe an account of the events of St Bartholomew's Day which represented them as the successful suppression of a Huguenot revolt, the averting of a danger nipped in the bud by the prompt action of the court and the armed militia of Paris. Gregory XIII's

¹ Cf. Mariejol, *Catherine de Médici*, p. 193, note b. It may be noted that in several places Catholics protected the Huguenots, e.g. at Lisieux the bishop was their protector and in Paris itself the Jesuits gave secure refuge to many of them.

² Raleigh's *History of the World*, iv 2 16, Favyn's *History of Navarre*, pp. 858, 859.

thanksgiving for the 'rout of the Huguenots' was, for instance, offered under the impression that there had been not a treacherous massacre but an armed conflict, the outcome of an abortive revolt that menaced the life of the king.

4 FROM THE EDICT OF BEAULIEU TO THE EDICT OF NEMOURS

The massacre of St Bartholomew plunged the realm into a state of confusion. Religious motives had often been only a minor factor in the preceding wars. They were now definitely relegated to the background. The country lapsed into anarchy. Brigandage was everywhere added to civil war. The factions were in a perpetual state of effervescence. Only the more salient episodes can be here recalled.

(a) *Fourth War.* A general rising followed close on the slaughter of 1572. The synod of pastors at La Rochelle appealed for help to Queen Elizabeth. The duke of Anjou laid siege to the town, was unsuccessful and left shortly afterwards for Poland, of which he had been elected king. Charles IX brought the war to an end by the edict of Boulogne issued in July 1573.

(b) *Fifth War.* The Edict of Boulogne, also called of La Rochelle, had not been accepted by the Protestants of Quercy and Languedoc. Meetings of protest had taken place at Millau in the Aveyron and at Montauban in the Tarn-et-Garonne. The Calvinists had drawn up a programme of demands which the king could not possibly grant. They had established in Languedoc and Upper Guienne what were virtually independent, federative republics, with elective governors and assemblies which claimed the power of levying taxes on Protestants and Catholics alike. They announced their intention of setting up similar republics throughout all France as soon as they might be able to do so. Meanwhile, they demanded from the king complete and immediate liberty of conscience and worship in all parts of France, and the cession, as security, of two fortresses in every province in the land. A third party was formed of Catholics opposed to the policy of suppressing the Calvinists. They were called the *Politiques* or *Malcontents*, and they took for their leader the duke of Alençon, the youngest of the sons of

Catherine de' Médici, an arrogant, blundering youth. One of their most distinguished captains was Damville, a son of the constable Anne de Montmorency, who had carved out for himself in Languedoc what amounted to a second kingdom. War was on the point of breaking out again when on the 30th May 1574 Charles IX died.

His brother, the duke of Anjou, immediately left Poland to come and take possession of the kingdom under the name of Henry III. He had acquired a certain reputation by the victories of Jarnac and Montcontour. But he now showed appalling lethargy. On the 12th January 1575 the *Politiques* concluded with the Protestants a union which constituted a sort of independent republic in the realm. Henry III attempted to propitiate them by concessions. The two young princes of Condé and Navarre, who ever since St. Bartholomew's day had been kept as prisoners at court, had succeeded in effecting their escape, the former in 1575, the latter in February of the following year, and had brought the Calvinists the prestige of their name and dignity as princes of the Blood. Condé entered into negotiations with the German Protestants with a view to obtaining military assistance. Overwhelmed and distraught, the king submitted to signing the Edict of Beaulieu on the 7th May 1576, which put an end to the fifth war and was called 'The Peace of Monsieur' because the terms of it were discussed between the king and 'Monsieur',¹ his brother, the duke of Alençon.

The Edict of Beaulieu gave the duke of Alençon the title of duke of Anjou with an annual income of 300,000 livres. The Protestants received eight fortified towns, a general amnesty for past misdeeds, the rehabilitation of the victims of St. Bartholomew's Day, liberty to worship everywhere throughout the kingdom, with the exception of Paris and the court and a radius

¹ The title 'Monsieur', it may be noted in passing, has had an interesting career. It was reserved in the Middle Ages to the Saints. Then it became applied to the Pope, 'Monsieur Clément, souverain seigneur et gouverneur de l'Eglise', then to the king of France in public decrees until the end of the Valois, then to the princes of the Blood, then, in the sixteenth century, to the younger brother of the king, and finally, after the Revolution, to all and sundry. It is still the title used by the priests of the Sulpician congregation founded by M. Olier in 1641.

of two leagues round both, liberty to assemble in consistories and synods, equal representation in several of the provincial parliaments to sit in judgement in cases involving their fellows. It was indeed an occasion for the Catholics to repeat the famous remark of Blaise de Montluc 'We had beaten our enemies not once but again and again. But whatever we won by arms, they recovered by those damned treaties'

(c) *The Formation of the League and the Sixth War*¹ The Edict of Beaulieu, as might have been expected, provoked a Catholic reaction. Picardy, the country of Calvin, set the example in protesting. There the *League* was formed in 1576 'to hinder and prevent the Huguenots in their subtleties and crafty conspiracies by a Holy Christian Union, absolute understanding and agreement between all good, loyal subjects of the king'². The League had no sooner been formed than it chose for its leader Henry of Guise, who had distinguished himself in the battle of Dormans,³ in the Marne, on the 10th October 1575. Henry III quickly realized the importance of the new institution and determined to make himself master of the League. He made advances to his brother to detach him from the Huguenots, convoked the States-General at Blois in December 1576, made them repudiate the Edict of Beaulieu, repudiated it himself, and proclaimed himself head of the League. The main feature of the war which ensued was the customary ravaging of the countryside. It was concluded with the peace of Bergerac in the Dordogne, on the 17th September 1577, itself completed by the Edict of Poitiers.

(d) *The Lovers' War* France then presented an extraordinary spectacle. The king, while making occasionally a show of devotion, surrounded himself with debauched, insolent courtiers,

¹ Mr Maurice Wilkinson's *History of the League, 1576-95*, contains a wholly admirable account of the history of France at the period and a formidable bibliography (Glasgow, 1929).

² Among the objects of the League was enumerated the restoration of 'the ancient liberties of the French people'. This, however, proved to be a mere pious wish, to which no effect was given. The declaration may, however, have had some influence in suggesting to the king the convocation of the States-General at Blois.

³ He was shot in the jaw with a bullet from an arquebus and thereafter was known as *le Balafré*, the 'Man with the scar'.

who often decked themselves out in women's apparel, but with swords always ready to their hands, like hired bravos. They were nicknamed the *Mignons*, 'the darlings'. The court became a den of cut-throats and a centre of vice. Pamphlets of virulent contempt were circulated against the king and the queen-mother. The duke of Anjou, always of an adventurous disposition, raised an army for an attempt to win himself a crown in the Netherlands. Damville continued to rule Languedoc like a despot. The young Henry of Navarre, who had married the king's sister, Queen 'Margot', was as far removed from Calvinist puritanism as Henry III from true Catholic piety. The young fools in his train conducted amorous intrigues and military expeditions with equal ardour, and the war which broke out again in 1580 is therefore known as the Lovers' War. It was a war, like the others, of sieges, ambushes, slaughter, and pillage, and was brought to an end by the treaty of Fleix in the Dordogne on the 26th December 1580.

(e) *The Resurrection of the League* The duke of Anjou had failed completely in the Netherlands. He was driven out of the country after a campaign which lasted only a year (1581-2) and returned to France to die of shame, grief, and consumption. His death at Château-Thierry on the 10th June 1584 raised the most complicated problems. The king's next-of-kin—the king was childless—was now Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot. The question was, would the Catholics tolerate as a sovereign a man who because of his religion was, in a way, a foreigner in the country? The prospect filled them with apprehension. The League was revived, and on the 31st December 1584 concluded with the king of Spain the Pact of Joinville,¹ with the object of opposing the king of Navarre by every means in their power. He, on the other hand, with the secret support of the king, sought to make use of Condé to obtain the assistance of the Germans and Damville, to enlist the support of the *Politiques*. Henry of Guise, however, at the head of the League, acted more promptly than his opponents. The king was taken by surprise at the parade of the confederates and compelled to sign the

¹ *Corps Diplomatique*, Dumont, vol v, pp 411 et seq

Edict of Nemours on the 7th July 1585 Calvinism was outlawed equal representation in the parliaments was abolished, Calvinist ministers were ordered to quit the country within a month, their co-religionists were compelled to choose between abjuring their beliefs or going into exile within six months Catholics throughout the kingdom greeted with enthusiasm the news of this agreement between the king and the League, but another war had become inevitable.

5. FROM THE EDICT OF NEMOURS TO THE EDICT OF NANTES (1585-98)

The king of Navarre later told Pierre Matthieu, the Lyons advocate who became his historiographer, that the news of the peace of Nemours so astounded him that one-half of his moustache turned white In fact, however, he recovered quickly, protested against the edict, and exerted himself to maintain his alliance with Damville A Bull of Excommunication, dated the 5th September 1585, was launched against him by Pope Sixtus V, declaring that he was unfit to succeed to the throne of France, depriving him of his estates, and absolving his vassals of allegiance It left Navarre unmoved

(a) *The 'War of the Three Henri's' or the Eighth War.* The king was in a singularly difficult position between the two parties. He felt humiliated under the yoke of the League, but he was also exasperated by the continued opposition of the Huguenots. Catherine, his mother, realized that the conversion of the king of Navarre would be the way to settle everything. She succeeded in arranging an interview with him at Saint-Brès, near Cognac, on the 13th December 1586, but the king proved obdurate The League was irritated by such negotiations and insisted with the king that the Edict of Nemours should be enforced to the letter. The abominable behaviour of Queen Elizabeth's government to Mary, queen of Scots, and the execution of that unfortunate princess on the 8th February 1587 in the hall of Fotheringay Castle, were fresh fuel on the fire of hatred with which the Catholics of France burned against the Protestants, and still further inflamed the ardour of the populace and the

bourgeoisie to support the League King Henry III was compelled to yield to the pressure brought to bear upon him and war broke out once more His favourite, Joyeuse, however, was defeated and killed on the 20th October 1587, at the battle of Coutras in the Gironde, which was won by Henry of Navarre. The duke of Guise, on the other hand, gained a brilliant victory over the German mercenaries on the 24th November at Auneau, not far from Chartres His popularity became extreme and the king in fear and jealousy forbade him to set foot in the capital The duke in his turn 'crossed the Rubicon' (the expression is d'Aubigné's), formally disobeyed the order of the king, and entered Paris on the 9th May 1588 The populace forthwith rose. Henry III, with a view to intimidating the enthusiastic supporters of the duke, committed the mistake of bringing troops into the city which enjoyed the privilege of maintaining its own police. On Thursday 12th May barricades were erected in every street in Paris The royal troops were attacked and disarmed, the king compelled to flee for refuge to Chartres Two months later he signed his surrender by publishing, at the request of the Leaguers, the Edict of July, which confirmed the Edict of Nemours and formally excluded every heretical prince from the throne

(b) *The Murder of the Duke of Guise* Meanwhile, the king had assembled the States-General at Blois, on the 16th October 1588. On the 5th November they declared the king of Navarre to be deprived of all his rights, and proclaimed his uncle, the cardinal of Bourbon, Dauphin Exasperated by the series of humiliations to which he had been subjected for so many years, the king conceived the sinister design of having the duke of Guise murdered. The plan was carried out in the narrow passage leading to the king's ante-chamber by some of the *Cadets de Gascoigne* who formed the famous body-guard of 'the Forty-Five' The deed was done early in the morning of Friday, 23rd December 1588 Guise was within a few days of completing his thirty-eighth year The cardinal, his brother, was arrested at the same time and put to death the next day. The bodies of the two brothers were burnt and their ashes thrown into the Loire. 'The king's first outing', d'Aubigné relates, 'was to bring the news in

person to the queen, his mother. He greeted her as a king, unattended. "Madam," said he to her "I have no attendants I have had Guise killed!" She shuddered and said "Sir, my son, God grant that your affairs may prosper thereby but I foresee that they will grow worse and some great misfortune will befall us." Catherine de' Médici did not live long enough to see the realization of her prophecy. She passed away on the 5th January following, with words of despair upon her lips¹

The fury of the Leaguers knew no bounds In Paris the *Sixteen*,² who commanded in the name of the League, made reprisals on the *Politiques* or *Royalists*. The city fell completely under the influence of the adherents of the Guises and was the perpetual theatre of the violent demonstrations in favour of the League. The rest of France was wrought to fever pitch The duke of Mayenne, the brother of Henry of Guise, assumed control of the movement and began distributing civil and military commissions as though he were a sovereign Paris presently proclaimed him Lieutenant-General of the kingdom, and he took the chief command of the League. Orléans, Troyes, Angers, Poitiers, Lyons, Bourges, the whole of Brittany, Bordeaux, and Toulouse, were heart and soul with it. The king, always weak and irresolute, was incapable even of profiting by his crime to reap its political advantages, and rejected with contumely by the League, he turned to Henry of Navarre.

The two kings met outside Tours, recaptured most of the towns in the Isle of France and proceeded to besiege Paris on the 1st August 1589.

(c) *The Murder of the King and its Consequences.* On the very day on which the king arrived before his capital, a young Jacobin (Dominican) friar named Jacques Clément, twenty-two years old, sought an interview with him in the house in which

¹ For a full account of this famous murder cf Miron's *Narratives* A discussion of the casuistry of it will be found in Lord Acton's introduction to Burd's edition of Machiavelli

² They were a revolutionary government secretly formed and called 'The Sixteen' as representing the sixteen sections of Paris The leaders at first were mostly lawyers The number of lawyers in the League was remarkable. Every revolution likes to have them, for they are useful to give an air of respectability to its acts. Cf Wilkinson, op. cit., at p. 52

Henry was lodging at Saint-Cloud on the pretext of having an important communication to make to him from his adherents in Paris. Once alone with the king, he drove a knife into his body and was himself slain on the spot by the royal guards. The king lingered long enough to receive the Last Sacraments with abundant faith and piety, and died a better death than he had lived, imploring forgiveness for his sins.

His disappearance made the situation more confused than ever. The Leaguers had taken an oath never to acknowledge Henry of Navarre. The cardinal of Bourbon, their nominee, under the name of Charles X., had been imprisoned ever since the murder of the Guises at Blois. He died soon after on the 9th May 1590, still a prisoner. The Guises had long been maintaining, or allowing it to be said, that they were of the blood of Charlemagne, that the crown was theirs by right as the line of Capet was clearly abandoned by God. Their claim, however, could not be taken seriously by anybody. They could only be descended from Charlemagne in the female line, and, moreover, they were only a younger branch of the house of Lorraine.

Henry of Navarre had no sooner been proclaimed king of France by his friends and partisans than he realized the hostility of the *Politiques* who had hitherto marched under his banner but who, as Catholics, were loath to acknowledge a heretic as king. On the other hand, he could not hope that the Huguenots alone would be strong enough to secure him the throne. A treaty was therefore concluded on the 4th August between the *Politiques* and the king. Henry promised to receive instruction, to maintain the existing privileges enjoyed by the Catholic religion throughout the country, and to send an ambassador to the Pope. Nevertheless the royalist party rapidly melted away. At the end of a week only 20,000 remained of the 42,000 who had stood in arms before the walls of Paris. Even the Huguenots began to desert, in irritation at Henry's concessions to Catholicism.

The new king's situation would have been desperate but for the fact that he was the most skilful, patient, deliberate, cautious politician of his time. On the other hand, his reputation for candour, courage, and good temper won him general sympathy.

Further, he was adept in holding the scales evenly between the two religions, in indulging the Catholics with hopes of his ultimate conversion without offending the susceptibilities of his former co-religionists. He was, nevertheless, compelled to raise the siege of Paris and to fall back on Dieppe, where he hoped to receive reinforcements from England.

The League meanwhile had received fresh accessions of strength from the Lyonnais, Lorraine, and the Netherlands, and Mayenne believed himself strong enough to take the offensive again. The battle he sought took place about four miles south of Dieppe at the confluence of the Béthune and the Arques, under the walls of the castle, from the 16th to the 28th September, in a series of sporadic engagements of varying intensity. The king had only a little force of 7,000 men with which to oppose an army of 30,000. But the expected reinforcements from England (4,000 under Lord Willoughby) and Scotland had time to arrive. Mayenne drew off on the 6th October. Each side claimed the victory.

A war of marching and countermarching, with incidental sieges, followed, and no decisive action until on the 14th March 1590 the two armies met on the plain of Saint-André, five miles west of Ivry on the Eure. The battle was the most popular of all the battles fought by Henry IV. He had only 8,000 infantry and 3,000 cavalry as against Mayenne's 20,000 foot and 4,500 horse. The king's chances seemed almost hopeless. He encouraged his soldiers to the fight, in words which have become famous: 'Comrades, God is on our side. There are His enemies and ours here is your king. At them! If your pennants fail you, rally to my white plume you will find it on the road which leads to victory and honour' (D'Aubigné).¹ Henry's little army

¹ And if my standard-bearer fall, as fall full well he may,
For never saw I promise yet of such a bloody fray,
Press where ye see my white plume shine, amidst the ranks of war,
And be your oriflamme to-day the helmet of Navarre.

From *Ivry A Song of the Huguenots*, by Lord Macaulay (1824). The oriflamme is the sacred banner of St Denis, a red silk banderole on a lance. The cornette is the standard of a cavalry squadron, and the *cornette blanche* consisted of black lilies on a white field. Ivry describes the capture of the *cornette blanche* in a letter to the Duke of Longueville cf his *Lettres Intimes*, ed. L Dussileux, p 143.

charged and Mayenne's centre was driven in. The king led his troops through the breach. the fight lasted for three hours and Mayenne was routed.

The disaster sowed division and mistrust among the Leaguers. Henry was able to return again to the siege of Paris, and the capital soon realized the horrors of famine. 'Wheat was selling at 120 crowns the bushel; and before long horses, dogs, and cats, had become recognized articles of diet. Even the grass that grew in the streets was eagerly sought after.' Paris was revictualled, however, by Alessandro Farnese, duke of Parma, the governor of the Spanish Netherlands, and once more enjoyed the satisfaction of seeing the king it refused to acknowledge forced to raise the siege on the 7th September 1590. So the war dragged on, a war of skirmishes and sudden attacks, of ambushes and surprises, with no notable engagement tending to any decisive result. The prestige of the League, however, sank lower and lower. The violence of some of its members, the lamentable failure of the States-General assembled by Mayenne to take counsel for the appointment of a successor to the pretender King Charles X, who had recently died, the hatred of the Spaniards, the success of the virulent pamphlets which ceaselessly poured contempt on the League, pamphlets like the famous Menippean Satire, and a host of others, above all the emergence of a 'Third Party' which claimed to arbitrate between the Leaguers and the Huguenots—all contributed to the rapid decline of the movement.

(d) *The Conversion of the King* Meanwhile some of Henry IV's staunchest adherents advised the king to become a Catholic. Rottan and Morlas, two Calvinist ministers, agreed to debate before him with Duperron, the learned Catholic controversialist. They admitted that the Roman Church was the oldest Church of all, *the Church*, in short, that salvation was to be obtained within its fold, and that Luther and Calvin '*had erred in making a section instead of a correction*'. The Marquis d'O, on the other hand, urging him in the name of the *Politiques* of the Third Party to become converted, boldly put the question to him. 'What have we to hope for from you, if you are determined

to send us all to hospital or death for an unreasonable obstinacy? If you were a prince of great piety and devotion, I should hesitate to address you in such terms but you are too fond of boon companions for us to imagine that all your actions are dictated by conscience' (D'Aubigné). The king as a result abjured Protestantism on the 25th July 1593. He had himself solemnly anointed as king and crowned at Chartres and heard Mass at St Denis on the 27th February 1594. After this the towns and the nobles quickly rallied to his side. Paris opened its gates on the 22nd March. The Spaniards marched out on the same day Rouen, Abbeville, Rheims, Laon, and Poitiers surrendered in the course of the year. On the 18th September 1595 Pope Clement VIII removed the ban of excommunication. The submission of Mayenne and the grant of a generous amnesty brought the civil war to an end.

6 THE EDICT OF NANTES

Only the Huguenots found themselves at any advantage from these events. They had reorganized themselves at the synod of Sainte-Foy in May 1594, and were persistent in claiming from the king, their ex-co-religionist, such guarantees as they considered necessary for the free exercise of their rites. The king negotiated with them unperturbedly, steadfastly declaring that it was his desire that 'peace with the Reformed party should be the last peace of all'.

War had broken out officially between Spain and France on the 17th January 1595. Its main features had been the battle of Fontaine-Française in Burgundy on the 3rd June 1595, followed by the siege of Amiens from April to September 1597. The Treaty of Vervins on the 2nd May 1598 brought hostilities to an end. A few days earlier, on the 13th April, Henry IV had agreed to sign the Edict of Nantes which finally settled the legal position of the Protestants. The edict was revoked by Louis XIV on the 17th October 1685. It lasted, therefore, for eighty-seven years. It comprised an edict in ninety-three articles—fifty-five of which were in a secret schedule—and a brevet containing a further twenty-three secret articles. Only

the edict in ninety-three articles was declared irrevocable in perpetuity.¹ It granted an amnesty for all acts and deeds since 1585, freedom of conscience to members of the reformed religion throughout the kingdom, liberty to the great nobles to practise the rites of their religion in their own houses before all who cared to attend, to the lesser nobles for their families and a congregation of not more than ten persons, the same liberty of public worship, in addition in every town in which it had been enjoyed during the first eight months of 1597, and an alternative place of worship in every bailiwick with the exception of Paris and a radius of five leagues round the capital, the army and the Court, and, lastly, open access to all civil and military offices and honours. In virtue of the brevet annexed to the edict the king granted to the Huguenots, or as they were to be officially designated, 'the members of the R. P. R.' (*Religion prétendue réformée*, the 'alleged reformed religion') an annual allowance of 45,000 crowns for the maintenance of their ministers. The first secret articles determined the localities reserved for public worship in each bailiwick, the second scheduled the names of nearly one hundred and fifty fortified towns granted to the Protestants for eight years. First in order came the so-called 'hostage towns', the most important of which were Saumur, Niort, Châtellerault, Thouars, Pons, St. Jean-d'Angely, Castillon, Lectoure, Montpellier, and Aigues-Mortes.

There was this element of novelty introduced into the municipal law that the Calvinists were under no obligation to belong to the official religion of the State, that their private religion with its forms of worship was legally tolerated. But what was serious in the concessions made to them was the grant of fortified towns. They expected that though the term of eight years was named in the edict, such fortified towns would be theirs in perpetuity. The temptation was strong to regard as an indispensable arrangement what was intended merely as a provisional measure to allow the passions which had been aroused

¹ This, however, was the usual formula in all royal edicts of this period in France. Its effect was lessened by the accepted theory that an edict being an act of the supreme sovereign will of the king could be modified or annulled by the same absolute power.

time to cool. It was left for Richeheu to find their pretensions to form a State within a State intolerable and to wrest from them by force of arms the strongholds they were fully determined to retain.

The edict, however, gave France an interval of repose in which, under the beneficent rule of Henry IV, to repair the havoc which had laid the country waste. The decrease of Calvinists, to a small minority—not more than ten per cent. of the total population—marked a revival of Catholicism in the country.

SOURCES

Diplomatic correspondence in the first place, more particularly the dispatches of Venetian envoys or the Italians in general. Next the earliest known and most frequently used sources such as Theodore Beza's (*Theodore de Beze*) *Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Reformees de France*, 1521–63 (3 vols., Geneva, 1580), ed G Baum and E Cunitz, 3 vols., Paris, 1883–9, Jean Crespin's *Livre des martyrs depuis Jean Huss jusqu'en 1554* (1554) in the edition by D Benoist, *Histoire des Martyrs*, from the edition of 1619, Toulouse, 1885–7, Jacques Auguste de Thou's *Historiae sui temporis* (1604–8), cf the edition by S Buckley, London, 1733, Theodore-Agrippa d'Aubigné's *Histoire universelle depuis 1550 jusqu'en 1601*, ed A de Ruble for the Societe de l'hist. de France, Paris, 1886. There are in addition numerous memoirs, of which the best known are Blaise de Montluc's *Commentaires*, Michel de Castelnau's *Mémoires* ranging from 1559 to 1570, the *Lettres* of Étienne Pasquier (1529–1615), the *Mémoires* of Aubigné, the *Histoire de l'Etat de France sous le règne de François II*, 1576, by L Régnier de la Planche, ed J A C Buchon, Paris, 1836, *Mémoires de la Ligue*, Geneva, 1590–9, Amsterdam, 1758, the *Chronologie Septennaire* (1605) and the *Chronologie novennaire* (1608) for the period 1598–1604, of Pierre Victor Palma Cayet (1525–1610) and Sully's *Sages et royales économies d'Etat* (1634–62), frequently adapted and edited in the eighteenth century. The age was also prolific in pamphlets, of which by far the most famous is the *Satire Menippée* directed against the League (1594), a composite production which finally resolved itself into a sort of one act farce with a prologue and an epilogue. Reference should also be made to the *Avertissement des Catholiques anglais* (1586), and to the edition in ten volumes, Paris, 1881 et seq., by H de la Ferrière and G Baguenault de Puchesse of the *Lettres de Catherine de Médici*.

CHAPTER III

PHILIP II AND THE NETHERLANDS HIS STRUGGLES AGAINST THE MOSLEMS AND THE PROTESTANTS

Summary 1 The Moriscos of Andalusia the War against the Moslems 2 The Revolt in the Netherlands 3 The Suppression under the Duke of Alva 4 The failure of the conciliatory policy under Don Luis de Requesens and Don John of Austria 5 Definitive secession of the Netherlands 6 Philip II and England

I. THE MORISCOS OF ANDALUSIA THE WAR AGAINST THE MOSLEMS

THREE great designs, as has been seen, divided the mind of Charles V the struggle against France, the struggle against the Protestants, and the struggle against Islam and the Turks.

Charles V died on the 21st September 1558, and then Philip, hitherto resident in the Netherlands, returned to Spain (August 1559). His first care was to deal with the Moslem pirates who harried the Spanish coasts, a task which involved him in a series of expeditions from 1560 to 1574 and incidentally led to the cruel suppression of the Moriscos in Spain. It was followed by efforts which were on the whole successful to stay the expansion of the Ottoman Empire. Philip II thus rendered Christian civilization a service which has not been sufficiently recognized; for he helped to prevent the Mediterranean from becoming a Turkish lake. The risk of a Moslem domination of the western Mediterranean was thus destroyed, though the danger from sporadic piracy only ended in the nineteenth century.

In the year 1570 there was the tragic episode of the suppression of the Moriscos, descendants of the old Moors in the south of Spain who were compelled in the preceding century to choose between exile and conversion to Christianity, and had elected to be baptized. They were a hard-working and peaceful community of agriculturists and horticulturists in Andalusia. But their Spanish neighbours doubted the sincerity of their conversion and were jealous of their prosperity, so that a strong current of popular opinion favoured a policy of severity where the Moriscos were concerned. As early as 1526, Charles V had been disposed to follow it, and the Inquisition had been

established in Granada to enforce, after an appropriate interval, the drastic laws regarding apostates and the relapsed

The wretched Moriscos attempted to disarm the royal government by spontaneous offerings. On the accession of Philip II they made him a present of 100,000 ducats and a promise of an annual tribute of 3,000 towards the expenses of maintaining the Inquisition itself. No step could have been more submissive or conciliatory. Proceedings before the Inquisition, however, continued as briskly as before. Confiscation followed confiscation, and the most violent discontent was rife throughout the country. A decree of 1526, abolishing the right of asylum enjoyed by baronial estates, was renewed in 1565. Numerous Moriscos felt their lives endangered, and many fled for refuge to Africa, and to Salonika in Turkey, while others took to the hills. A fresh edict in 1567 added fuel to the flames. A number of Christian nobles, including the duke of Alva, the governor of Alcantara, Don Luis de Avila, and the captain-general of the province of Granada, the marquis of Mondejar, warned the government of the ferment brewing in the province and advised that the operation of the edict should be suspended for the time being. The extremists, however, prevailed.

The Moriscos committed the capital error of looking for help from their co-religionists in Africa and Asia with whom Spain was at this time at war. The Spaniards certainly treated the Moriscos with harshness, but, however mild the Spanish rule had been, it would have been hardly possible that the sympathies of the Moriscos would not have been with the enemies with which Spain was so desperately at war. Their attitude was treated as treachery in the face of the national enemy. The first troubles broke out in April 1568, when the Moriscos appealed for help to the sultan of Fez. Mondejar once more pressed for the edict to be revoked. He was not listened to. Philip II was obstinate. Slow to make up his mind, he was still more slow to change it. The revolt assumed a menacing aspect in December. The Moriscos declared their independence and appointed a king of their own, a certain Don Hernando of Cordova, who took the Arab name of Aben Humeya. He was

soon murdered, however, for having set his face against the reprisals wreaked upon the Christians by his followers. His place was taken by Adala Abenabo. All the mountain ranges round Granada were occupied by the rebels, reinforced by Turks and Algerines.

This was the occasion on which Don John of Austria, the twenty-four year old illegitimate son of Charles V, who had been called in to succeed Mondejar, first displayed the military talent which was later to lead to his appointment to the command of the Lepanto expedition. The rebels were everywhere hunted down and crushed. Their king, Abenabo, died by the hand of an assassin, and his death brought the war to an end. The surviving Moriscos were deported *en masse* from their homes and distributed throughout the provinces of Estremadura, Leon, Galicia, Castile, and Seville. The onus of responsibility must be borne by Philip II who had ordered the war to be waged *a fuego y a sangre*, 'with fire and blood'.

So much for the Moriscos, but, while Philip's energies were occupied with them at home, there came a new menace, at a time when many thought the Turkish peril would not be a serious one for years to come. Suleiman the Magnificent, the victor of Mohacs and one of the most warlike of the sultans, had died in 1566. In the year before, his fleet and army had failed disastrously in an attempt to capture Malta, the stronghold of the Knights of St John. His successor Selim II, was a half-imbecile debauchee. Ottoman historians have surnamed him 'the Drunkard'. The victory of the Christian arms at Malta and the reports of the helpless incapacity of the new sultan encouraged many to hope that for some time to come there would be little danger from the East. But while the 'Drunkard' sultan idled away his days, the veterans of Suleiman's campaigns were planning a naval enterprise on a grand scale, which they hoped would make them masters of the Mediterranean.

In the same year in which Suleiman died, one of the greatest of the Popes, the Dominican Cardinal Michele Ghislieri, a statesman as well as a saint, had succeeded to the see of Peter under the name of Pius V. From the outset of his pontificate he

was anxious to form a league of Catholic States as a safeguard against the Turkish peril, and was particularly anxious to secure the alliance of Venice, the chief maritime power of Italy. But the Venetians had long been chiefly occupied with their interests in Eastern trade. Their war fleets were neglected, and they had an understanding with the Turkish government which kept them neutral in the quarrel between Christendom and the Moslem power. For eighty years they had occupied Cyprus under a lease from the sultans and had come to regard it as a permanent possession. With Crete, it gave them an excellent trading base in the Levant.

It came as a surprise to the Doge and Senate of Venice when in the early summer of 1569 envoys from Constantinople arrived with a demand for the evacuation of Cyprus and the surrender of its two fortresses, Nicosia and Famagusta. It was added that a fleet and army was ready to enforce the demand. The Venetians rejected the summons, rightly conjecturing that it heralded a new scheme of Moslem aggression in the Mediterranean. Their next step was to send an embassy to St Pius V, asking for his help, and the arsenal of Venice was kept busy building and fitting out war galleys.

The Pope promised the help of the well-equipped squadron he maintained to guard the coasts of the Papal State against the Algerine corsairs, made a generous grant from his treasury towards fitting out the Venetian fleet, and sent envoys to the Knights of St John, the Genoese Republic, and the kings of France and Spain, asking for their alliance. The only effective response came from Genoa and Malta. Early in 1570, a Turkish fleet blockaded Cyprus, and landed a large army to besiege Nicosia. The Christian fleet, made up of the squadrons of the Holy See, Venice, Genoa, and the Knights of St John, inferior in numbers to the Moslem Armada, concentrated at Suda Bay in Crete. Colonna, the Papal admiral, was in command, but the fleet was really directed by a council of admirals, which wasted months in irresolute debate. At last when the weather was breaking, and news had come that Nicosia had fallen and the enemy were besieging Famagusta, it was decided that the

galleys could not keep the sea during the winter and the fleet dispersed. Only a few Venetian galleys remained at Suda Bay, and the rest of the ships returned to their home ports.

Pius V was bitterly disappointed but not discouraged. He resolved to organize a larger force for the next year and to insist on its being commanded by one resolute chief. After long negotiations he secured the alliance of Philip II, and the 'Treaty of the Holy League' was signed—a triple alliance of Rome, Venice, and Spain, the Pope undertaking to reinforce his own contingent with galleys of the Knights of St. John, Genoa, and the minor powers of Italy. There were to be 300 ships with 50,000 fighting men. As chief of the League, St. Pius claimed the right to appoint the commander-in-chief of the Fleet, and with the consent of Philip II, selected Don John of Austria.

The fleets of the League were assembling and organizing at Messina, when Famagusta, after having held out till the early summer of 1571, was starved into surrender, and the Turks were masters of Cyprus. They now took the course that had been foreseen and dreaded, so that even the Italian shores were menaced. Their fleet of nearly 300 sail rounded the south of Greece and established itself at an anchorage in the Bay of Lepanto, well within the Gulf of Corinth and protected by the forts of its seaward narrows. Here the Pashas received strong reinforcements of troops sent overland from Constantinople. This was the most formidable Moslem fleet that had ever appeared in the Mediterranean. It had been strengthened by squadrons from Syria and Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, and Algiers. Venice expected an immediate attack, but for some weeks the Captain Pasha waited for further reinforcements and employed detachments in raids on the villages of the Ionian Islands and Dalmatian coast.

At last, by the middle of September, Don John's fleet was ready to put out to sea. Its voyage, mostly under oar power, across the Adriatic to Corfu, lasted ten days, until the 26th September. Bad weather and the necessity of collecting information as to the enemy's position and strength entailed a further

delay But, leaving Corfu on the 30th, next day the Christian fleet, stretching for miles in one long line, was coasting southward towards the Gulf of Corinth Besides a flotilla of small storeships, Don John had with him 208 fighting ships, six of them heavily armed galleasses, and 202 galleys. He intended on the 2nd October to fight his way past the batteries of the narrows and attack the Turkish fleet in Lepanto Bay

But the famous battle was fought many miles westward of the place from which it is named, and on the open sea off the entrance of the gulf. As the leading ships of the Christian armada rounded the headlands, the Turkish fleet was seen coming out in line abreast to give them battle, its sails filled with a fair wind There was a terrible risk that the Allies, working only with the oar against a head wind, would be overwhelmed in detail while trying to form from line ahead into the battle-line abreast But suddenly there came a calm and the Turkish sails were seen coming down Don John and his men saw in this sudden change a sign that the prayers of Christendom were aiding them But their line, even so, was not yet completely formed when the Moslem galleys closed with them amid the thunder of guns from the broadsides of the galleasses and the bows of the galleys

Then came hours of hand-to-hand fighting, with the Moslem and Christian galleys locked together in a fierce mêlée It ended in nearly all the enemy ships being captured, sunk, or driven ashore, not without heavy loss to the victors Only one Turkish squadron extricated itself from the fight and fled away seaward Thousands of Christian galley slaves were liberated by the victor from the oar-benches of the vanquished fleet. These were the best trophies of Don John's victory. They carried the news of it to their homes all over western Europe. The Feast of Our Lady, Help of Christians, *Auxilium Christianorum*, kept each year on the 2nd October, is a lasting monument of the victory of Lepanto.

The great peril from Moslem sea power was at an end. The consequences of this success might have been of still greater importance if Philip II had not, from excess of prudence or

jealousy, checked his half-brother's successful career. Don John's ambition was to rouse Greece, which was already quivering at his summons, to march on Constantinople, to overthrow the Ottoman dynasty, and to revive the old Latin Empire. His plans received the warmest approval in Rome and from the clergy in general. But Venice, anxious not to lose her Eastern trade, preferred to conclude a separate peace with the sultan. By a treaty signed in Constantinople on the 7th March 1573, Cyprus was ceded to the Turk and the re-establishment of the *status quo* adopted.¹ Philip II, abandoned by Venice, discouraged by the death of the Pope and deeply concerned at the progress of the Protestants in Holland,² forbade the victor of Lepanto to do more than attack Tunis. The prince obeyed, seized the city in October 1573, and would have carved himself, in north Africa and at the expense of Islam, a kingdom worthy of his talents, but for the renewed opposition of the king which compelled him to abandon his design. Don John returned to Spain. The Turks put to sea again with 250 sail and recaptured Tunis in the following year (1574).

We shall meet Don John later in the Low Countries, but he was thenceforth unable to divest himself of the suspicions which attached to his high ambition. They poisoned the remainder of his short life.

2. THE REVOLT IN THE NETHERLANDS

We now come to the revolt of the Netherlands. Grave discontent had already been brewing for some time in the Spanish provinces of the north, from Flanders to the Frisian coastlands of Germany. There were many reasons for the ferment. Antoine Perrenot, cardinal de Granville, whose severity excited universal apprehension, had been appointed Prime Minister to the regent, Margaret, duchess of Parma, a natural daughter of Charles V. On the other hand, the continued maintenance of

¹ Pastor points out that Venice thus violated distinct treaty engagements with the Holy See and Philip II.

² The word 'Holland' meant at the time the one province of North Holland between the North Sea and the Zuider Zee, the 'Hollow Land' containing Amsterdam and Haarlem.

a force of Spanish soldiery, the reorganization of the ecclesiastical dioceses, which Philip II by arrangement with the Holy See increased in 1561 from four to seventeen bishoprics, his purpose being either to keep the clergy under closer surveillance or to have a greater number of nominees at hand in the Assembly of the Nobles, rumours current concerning an agreement reported to have been sworn at the signing of the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis between Henry II and Philip II, for the extirpation of Protestantism, fear of the Inquisition which had been introduced into the country by Charles V,¹ all conspired still further to exasperate and embitter the minds of a populace already highly inflamed by the relentless enforcement of former Edicts against the Protestants. Moreover, Philip II, who had lived in Flanders, was as unpopular as his father had been liked. His cold, reserved, and arrogant character was in violent contrast to the independent spirit of the local nobility, of whom in particular, William of Nassau, prince of Orange, and Lamoral, count of Egmont and prince of Gavre, offended him at an early date by their frank criticism of his policy.

It would be doing him an injustice, however, to consider Philip II as a mere blind despot animated by no other feeling than the most sullen fanaticism. He was a painstaking and in many respects an enlightened ruler, but determined to suffer no infringement of the royal authority as it had been exercised by his father. But it would seem that the Protestants of the Netherlands harboured the design of securing by force from a younger king what they had not dared to hope for from the prestige and power of Charles V, and concessions by the Executive in the beginning merely emboldened them to greater enterprise in the future.

The king had agreed to withdraw his Spanish troops. The Calvinists immediately seized the opportunity to make public demonstrations in defiance of the law laid down by Charles V. Numerous meetings were held at which sermons were preached

¹ St. Pius V had opposed Philip's proposal to introduce the Spanish Inquisition into his Italian possessions. He counselled moderation in the Netherlands, advised him to go there himself, and was opposed to harsh measures. Pastor shows he was kept in ignorance of Alva's severities.

by their pastors and psalms sung according to the practice of Geneva. The regent did not dare suppress such breaches of the law for fear of provoking still greater disturbances. Granvelle and the duke of Alva, on the other hand, egged the king on to greater severity. Granvelle was appointed archbishop of Malines. He made his State entry in December 1561, and met with cold reception. Some of the nobles protested to the king. He turned a deaf ear to their complaints. But the resignation of their dignities as Counsellors of State by the prince of Orange and Egmont, and the avalanche of petitions which descended on Philip finally shook his determination. He sacrificed Granvelle, who left Brussels and retired to his paternal estates near Besançon (1564). Nevertheless the enforcement of the law of the Inquisition for the suppression of Protestantism, the barbarous severity of Peter Titelman, one of the Inquisitors, and other officials supported and encouraged in secret by the king in spite of protests from the regent, produced acute tension.

A deputation led by Egmont made the journey to Spain in January 1565 to lay their complaints before Philip. He promised the delegates of the nobility to correct abuses and mitigate the severity of his decrees. But he instructed the regent, at the same time, rigorously to enforce the laws against Protestantism. The recollection of the Anabaptist excesses at Munster in 1534 and the spectacle of France devastated by the horrors of civil war seem to have hardened the king in his determination and he wrote to his sister, Margaret of Parma, that he was prepared, if need be, to burn sixty or seventy thousand persons to root Protestantism out of Flanders.

The Protestants began to emigrate to England. Others organized a campaign of public meetings and lampoons, broadsheets and pamphlets against the Inquisition. The towns in Brabant were the most excited and the anti-Protestant decrees were there denounced as encroachments upon the liberties of the country. The lesser nobility, mostly Calvinist, formed at Breda a League against the Inquisition (November 1565). Three hundred gentlemen, members of the League, under the leadership of Hendrik van Brederode and Count Louis of

Nassau (William's younger brother), came to present their grievances to Margaret of Parma at Brussels Count Barleymont, a counsellor, exhorted her to pay no attention to the complaints of 'those beggars' (*ces Gueux*) The word was not forgotten. The malcontents adopted the name and openly paraded the insignia of beggary, a wallet and a wooden bowl Many Catholics supported them in their refusal to be deprived of their traditional liberties and the regent was panic-stricken and yielded. The 'Beggars' celebrated their victory with much feasting and resumed their Calvinist preachings

On the urgent representations of the regent, Philip II made a grudging attempt at conciliation, but only after long hesitation and in presence of a threat of a rebellion (July 1566). He abolished the Inquisition, leaving it to the bishops to take proceedings against heretics, and granted a partial amnesty, but he still maintained the anti-Protestant decrees

As soon as the news was received, the whole country was in a ferment. The Beggars considered the king's concessions inadequate and prepared for war Revolts broke out in Antwerp, Malines, Valenciennes, Saint-Omer, and other places. In Antwerp the Calvinists attended their prayer-meetings in arms and defied the authorities Bands of fanatics, animated by the most extravagant iconoclastic frenzy, broke into the churches of Saint-Omer on the 14th August 1566. They wrecked the altars, smashed the statues to pieces, and destroyed every object of art and beauty that fell in their way Convents and churches were pillaged, sacked, and destroyed at Courtrai, Valenciennes, and Tournai The magnificent cathedral at Antwerp was seriously damaged by Protestant zealots on the 16th-17th August. The Netherlands were abandoned for a fortnight to an orgy of devastation The Catholic members of the League of Breda were incensed by these outrages, and Egmont, Montigny, Hoorne, and Arschot all assisted the regent and the imperial troops to put down the excesses.

When he heard that the Protestants had taken the initiative in a civil war, that they had burned or pillaged over four hundred Catholic churches and transformed a number of them

into Calvinist places of worship, Philip II was furious and declared his intention of going to Flanders in person at the head of a powerful army to restore order Pope Pius V, de Granvelle, and Ruy Gomez de Silva, the king's confidential adviser, while approving his zeal, advised a conciliatory policy, the king decided to remain in Spain He entrusted the duke of Alva with the task of suppressing the revolt The Calvinists thereupon made an attempt on Utrecht and Amsterdam They failed, and the ringleaders, led by Van Brederode, fled for refuge to Germany, where the prince of Orange had vast estates He undertook to give them hospitality and shelter from the severity of Philip II.

3 THE REPRESSION UNDER THE DUKE OF ALVA (1567-73)

Alva had won a high reputation A courageous soldier, a general of the first rank, the victor over the Protestant League at Muhlberg and the conqueror of Rome from the armies of Pope Paul IV, he was a typical soldier, but no statesman. Into his policy as governor he brought the grim severity of military discipline He cringed before his sovereign, but was pitiless towards his inferiors and consumed with a fanatic hatred of the Protestants Alva's face was long and triangular, his forehead bold, his cheeks hollow, and his beard pointed, so that, making allowance for the difference between a theologian and a general, he bore a strong resemblance to Calvin, an indication to the outside world of a character of cold and calculating severity. His orders were to crush the slightest inclination in the nobles to any kind of independence, and he showed the same severity to Catholic and Protestant alike. The capital error made by the government of Philip II was its failure to distinguish between the currents of opinion and motives of action of those over whom he ruled.

Margaret of Parma was discouraged and lost heart Exasperated by the humiliation of her position, she sent in her resignation and left the Netherlands in December for her home in Italy.

Alva arrived in Brussels on the 22nd August 1567, at the head of an army of 10,000 Spaniards and Italians, and the mere

presence of these foreign troops infuriated the Flemings. His first care was to arrest the two Catholic nobles, Egmont and Hoorne, at a banquet given on the 9th September. He then created a special tribunal—known officially as the ‘Council of the Troubles’, but soon popularly called the ‘Council of Blood’—to try them. The judges were instructed to show no clemency, and the spies who swarmed everywhere were not slow in providing them with work. As many as five hundred persons were condemned to death in one day. The Catholic world and the German Emperor himself indignantly protested. Philip hardened his heart and threw his mantle over the duke of Alva.

Orange meanwhile was far from idle. Crowds of malcontents flocked to him, while volunteers poured in from the Protestant countries. In the Netherlands, as in France, Cecil pursued the policy of paralysing Elizabeth’s Catholic rivals by support of those in rebellion against them. Elizabeth disliked the policy, but was not strong enough to prevent it. Before long Orange had an army of 20,000 men under his command. His brother, Louis of Nassau, invaded the Netherlands from Friesland in May 1568 and gained some successes over the Spanish troops. The duke of Alva replied with an increase of severity. Egmont and Hoorne were executed on the 5th June 1568, in spite of numerous petitions to spare them presented by princes, bishops, and cardinals.

The discovery of a plot against the duke of Alva was followed by a fresh series of repressive measures. The country was subjected to a reign of terror while the invasion made by Nassau was repulsed. Alva should have taken the opportunity of his victory to mitigate his severity. The bishops implored him to do so, but nothing moved his stony heart. Instead, he wantonly added to the grievances from which the people already suffered a yet further grievance. He imposed a tax of 10 per cent.—the ‘tenth penny’—on all transfers of real estate, a tax of 5 per cent—the ‘twentieth penny’—on the sale of all commodities, to be paid every time they were sold. The tax was based on the Spanish model, but what was tolerable in an agricultural country where there was comparatively little exchange of

commodities would have been ruinously destructive of the life of the commercial centre of the world, of a community whose whole livelihood depended on the preservation of ample facilities for sale and purchase. The trading community protested so vigorously that the duke agreed to compromise on condition that 4,000,000 gold florins should be paid to the treasury within two years. When the two years had elapsed, in 1570, he determined to re-impose his tax on sales. The opposition this time was still more general and determined. The mass of the people, the States, the clergy, the whole nation rose in a body against such merciless taxation. But nothing could shake the obstinacy of Alva.

Meanwhile, news was brought that the 'Beggars of the Sea'—the successors of the old 'Beggars' League had been disbanded before the arrival of the Duke—had with the encouragement and support of the Prince of Orange, seized the little port of Brill, at the mouth of the Maas (1st April 1572). The patriots were fired with enthusiasm. The north-western provinces, Holland, Zeeland, Gelderland, Overyssel, and Utrecht, rose in revolt. The rebels, who counted upon the support of England and France, where Coligny was pleading their cause before the king, swore allegiance to the king of Spain, but proclaimed William of Orange to be governor instead of the detested duke of Alva. Such was the beginning of what came to be known as the Union of Dordrecht, 13th August 1572, the first step towards the independence of 'Holland'.

Louis of Nassau had seized Mons in May. His brother William, later surnamed 'the Silent', invaded Flanders with an army. The duke of Alva revoked his decree in order to rally the Catholics to his support, but it was too late. The prince of Orange might, perhaps, have overthrown the duke of Alva, if the support of the French Calvinists had not suddenly failed in consequence of the massacre of St Bartholomew. The Spanish troops gained the upper hand. The lost towns were recaptured and sacked without mercy. A price was set on the head of William of Nassau as a rebel subject. The wretched country was ravaged with fire and sword. The roving irregulars of the

prince of Orange showing no more mercy to their co-religionists than the duke of Alva's troops had shown to the Catholics All of a sudden it was learned that Philip II had recalled the duke of Alva (October 1573)

4 FAILURE OF THE POLICY OF CONCILIATION UNDER DON LUIS DE REQUESENS AND DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA (1573-8)

The flood of petitions from such as were on the king's side, the representations made by the Pope, the ex-regent, and de Granvelle, above all, the exhaustion of the treasury no less than his military losses, had finally convinced Philip II that Alva was pursuing the wrong course. The duke, he said, 'had stolen the Low Countries from him' He appointed Don Luis de Requesens, governor of Castile, to take his place. The new governor had no sooner arrived than he realized the extent of the task before him and the difficulties in his way His letters to the king, dated the 30th December 1573, set them out in detail—lack of money, the impossibility of paying the troops and taking the field, desertions from the ranks and want of discipline among soldiers and sailors, a general sympathy among the nobility with the rebels, universal discontent provoked not so much by religious as political causes, administrative chaos, vast expenditure to secure insignificant results, peculation by civil and military officers in high places. It was the administrative chaos more than anything which lost Spain the attachment of the proud and industrious populations of the Low Countries

Don Luis had a fairly strong army under his command, but he was unable to prevent the rebels from capturing Middelburg on the 29th January 1574. He gained a victory in the bloody battle of Mooker Heide near Nymegen in April, when both the brothers Louis and Henry of Nassau were killed, but he was unable to follow up his victory because the soldiers rebelled on the evening of the day against the skilful and experienced old soldier, Sancho D'Avila, the successful general, who was unable to pay them, chose a general of their own, marched on Antwerp, threatened the governor and dictated their own terms. The

weakness of Spain in the Netherlands was thus made manifest to all. His most devoted adherents began to abandon Philip. The conciliatory measures adopted by Requesens, a general amnesty, the abolition of the Council of the Troubles, the alleviation of taxation, were all barren of result.

The governor was compelled to negotiate with Orange. But the religious question again intervened. The prince insisted that the Protestants should have liberty to worship in their own way. Requesens's instructions were peremptory, not to yield 'in any matter affecting our Holy Catholic Faith . . . even at the risk of losing the State'

The conversations were broken off. Requesens was no more successful in the field. The Spaniards were forced to raise the siege of Leyden. The town was saved by William of Orange's breaking the dykes and bringing supplies on shipboard across the floods to the starving town. Negotiations were begun again, but again they failed owing to the opposing views on the religious question (12th July 1575). Three months later, in October, the two provinces of Holland and Zeeland proclaimed their independence. It was the first step towards the separation of the Protestant from the Catholic Netherlands, which we now call Belgium.

Requesens once more tempted the fortune of war. He gained a few victories, but was again defeated by the usual difficulties. lack of money, want of discipline, mutiny among the soldiers.

The governor fell ill of fever, and died suddenly on the 5th March 1576 at Brussels.

His death involved Philip II in a maze of perplexities. The king could only come to a decision slowly, after long, laborious consideration. He was incapable of improvising. Eight months elapsed before he found a successor for Requesens, so that the wonder was that the Netherlands retained their Spanish allegiance. The troops were in open revolt. The Council of Government was in despair and made the mistake of arming the Dutch themselves. The new militia resolved to impose its own terms, and the members of the Council were for a time held captive by the troops. The mutinous soldiers fought

amongst themselves, natives against foreigners, and sacked Antwerp, Maestricht, and other towns. The whole country before long rose in revolt against Spain. The Dutch provinces, with the exception of Luxembourg, signed with Holland and Zeeland a defensive treaty known in history as the Pacification of Ghent (November 1576), and bound themselves to unite their forces to drive the Spaniards and other foreigners out of the Netherlands, and once this was accomplished, to assemble the States-General to consider and resolve the political and religious problems distracting the country.

Philip II, meanwhile, had appointed to succeed Requesens in the onerous task of government Don John of Austria, the victor of Lepanto. The prince arrived in Luxembourg just as the compact of the Pacification of Ghent had been signed, at a moment when the situation seemed desperate. His first act was bold and statesmanlike. He announced his willingness to accept the Pacification of Ghent, and on the 12th February 1577 signed with the States-General, which had already assembled, a treaty called the Union of Brussels, or the Perpetual Edict, by which he undertook to send the Spanish troops away, to restore the liberties of the country, to maintain the Catholic religion, while restraining from religious persecution, and, lastly, to acknowledge the Prince of Orange as Governor of Holland and Zeeland.

He was then able to make his state entry into Brussels on the 1st May. Queen Elizabeth had long been supporting the malcontents. Don John formed a plan to attack England, whence the rebels derived all their strength, to deliver Mary Stuart from prison and share the throne with her. The jealousy of Philip II thwarted this ambitious scheme. He then entertained the idea of marrying Elizabeth of England herself and added his name to the already long list of suitors with pretensions to the hand of the 'Virgin Queen'. Philip thwarted him again. The prince felt that he was under a perpetual cloud of suspicion. Holland and Zeeland, meanwhile, had repudiated the Perpetual Edict. Orange, whose personal interests were involved, was all for resistance. Negotiations begun with him

personally failed on account of his unyielding obstinacy (May 1577). He hoped to wrest the Netherlands entirely from the Spanish dominion and turned a deaf ear to any suggestion of peace or reconciliation.

Don John was in a critical position. The mutinous soldiers at Antwerp refused to go. The royal troops sent against them were defeated. The Catholic Flemings were unwilling to bear arms against the Protestant rebels, who enjoyed the secret support of England. The prince of Orange was able to invade Flanders, and on the 23rd September 1577 made a triumphal entry into Brussels. All Don John's work had crumbled away. Philip II then reverted to his policy of suppression and sent him reinforcements from Spain with orders to continue the war. Don John broke off negotiations with the States-General, whose demands increased daily, withdrew to Luxembourg (2nd October), and prepared to take the field again with his usual energy. On the 31st December 1577 the army, disciplined once more, won a victory at Gembloux. The Netherlanders were utterly routed, with the loss of not less than 6,000 men, while the victors suffered scarcely any casualties. But the perpetual lack of money brought Don John's career also to an end, while the troops at the disposal of Orange increased daily. Disheartened by his ill success, for ever thwarted in all his undertakings by the jealousy of his half-brother, the king of Spain, deeply affected by the murder, in circumstances still shrouded in mystery, of his secretary Escovedo who had become implicated in the mysterious drama of Antonio Perez and the princes of Eboli (31st March 1578), the prince fell ill of a malignant fever and closed his brilliant and adventurous life on the 1st October 1578, at the early age of thirty-three.

5. FINAL SECESSION OF THE NETHERLANDS (1579-97)

Fortune once more favoured Philip II, who had the good luck to find a man of genius in his own family to succeed the ill-fated Don John. This was Alessandro Farnese, duke of Parma, the son of the ex-regent, Margaret of Parma, whose popularity was still undiminished in the Netherlands. Farnese was a young

man of thirty-two and had served under the orders of his uncles Don John, at Lepanto and Gembloix. In this latter action his cavalry charge had decided the day He was not inferior to Don John in diplomacy and in the field, while surpassing him in the astuteness and sagacity of his policy

Farnese was skilful enough to win over the Catholics by playing upon their alarm at the progress made by the Protestants He induced them to sign a formal deed of acknowledgement of the rights of Philip II over the Netherlands (April 1579) A series of brilliant military victories—the capture of Maestricht after a terrible siege of four months, and of Louvain, Malines, and Brussels all in the same year—restored the military situation.

The king and de Granvelle, however, rejected his advice, and by the promulgation of the 'Ban', dated from Maestricht, the 15th March 1581, put a price on the head of William of Orange, whom they denounced to the world as a traitor, a miscreant, and an enemy of the human race A reward of 25,000 crowns in gold or land and a patent of nobility was offered to any one who handed him over dead or alive or took his life.

At the news, the non-Walloon provinces declared their secession Brabant, Flanders, Utrecht, Gelderland, Holland, and Zeeland, by the 'Act of Abjuration of The Hague', 26th July 1581, solemnly declared that the king of Spain was deposed from his sovereignty over them on account of his tyranny and misrule The situation was still further complicated by the armed intervention, already mentioned, of the duke of Anjou, whose brief incursion ended in disaster William of Orange, however, fell a victim, on the 10th July 1584, to the pistol of a fanatical assassin, a young Burgundian, named Balthasar Gérard, who received his reward from Philip II. His death disordered the enemy's ranks, and Farnese seized the opportunity to recapture Antwerp after a long siege which firmly secured his military reputation

He had recovered the whole country from Dunkirk and Nieuport to Nymegen, Maestricht, and Ruremonde. He might, perhaps, have succeeded in reconquering the whole of the

Netherlands, if the adventure of the 'Great Armada', on the one hand, and the policy of an alliance between Spain and the Holy League on the other, had not distracted his attention from the situation in Flanders.

While he was busy fighting Henry IV with the Leaguers in France, the Protestants retook Breda, Zutphen, Deventer, and Nymegen. Philip II thus brought to naught the plans and aspirations of Farnese as he had destroyed those of Don John, and on the 2nd December 1592 Alessandro died, broken-hearted at the ruin of his work.

With the death of Alessandro Farnese the story of the interminable conflict loses all interest. His successors, the aged Count Mansfeld, the frivolous and self-indulgent Archduke Ernest, the count of Fuentes, and the Archduke Cardinal Albert, although certainly men of ability, were almost invariably defeated by Maurice of Nassau, the son of William the Silent. There were recurring mutinies of the troops when they received no pay, and operations were thus again and again paralysed. In 1596 England and France formally acknowledged the Republic of the Netherlands, and a new power thereby made its appearance in Europe. In 1597 Maurice of Nassau succeeded in driving the Spanish troops out of the country, which was thenceforth known as Holland, or the United Provinces.

After a struggle of thirty years, Philip II saw himself compelled to give up a possession which had exhausted much of the energy and wealth of his kingdom. Yet it must be remembered that the Spaniards succeeded in maintaining their dominion over the greater part of their former possessions—the territory that henceforth was known as the Spanish Netherlands and which is, of course, the modern Belgium—while the annexation of Portugal, in 1580, with its oversea empire and trading stations in the Far East, was some compensation for the failure of his policy in the Netherlands.

6. PHILIP II AND ENGLAND

The Spanish historian Altamira makes the following important observation with reference to the policy pursued by

Philip II in regard to England. 'The king of Spain did not always subordinate his policy to the interests of his religion'¹ The breach between Spain and England was the result of a long series of quarrels in which the original provocation did not come from the Spanish side.

There had long been a traditional friendship between England and Spain. Philip II himself had been something more than the mere prince-consort of Mary Tudor. He had reigned jointly with her and the Acts of Parliament of the time were recorded as the statutes of 'Philip and Mary'.

In the opening years of Elizabeth's reign Philip sought to maintain the old entente between the two nations, he even dallied for a while with the idea that he might marry the new queen and thereby serve the interests alike of his religion and his crown. But with all his zeal for his religion and his determination to protect and maintain it in his hereditary dominions and new possessions, he had a marked reluctance for indulging in crusading adventures in other countries. Nor was Elizabeth willing to pay the necessary price of such an alliance by declaring herself Catholic. Yet the general political situation restrained him from an open rupture with England, long after Elizabeth's breach with the Holy See. The heavy anxieties entailed by the troubles of the Netherlands, the fear that France would profit by a war between the two neighbouring countries, and the serious expenditure any operations against England would involve long gave him pause.

An English historian of our own time, who takes full account of the contemporary evidence and pays no regard to the long enduring popular English prejudices against Spain, has borne authoritative testimony as to the real origin of Philip's conflict with Elizabeth. Professor Pollard, professor of English history in the university of London, in his *Political History of England*, thus sums up the facts:

It is the universal belief of the makers and owners of Empires that their dominions have been secured by purely defensive measures, and no picture is more popular than that of Elizabethan England

¹ *Historia de España*, III, 99

standing bravely at bay against Papal plots and Spanish Armadas In reality England was the aggressor, and few monarchs would have borne protracted provocation with Philip II's patience

Long before either he or the Pope struck a blow, Englishmen had been fighting and scheming to wrest provinces from the Roman Church and from the Spanish Empire Paul IV refused to declare the Queen illegitimate on Mary Stuart's behalf, and strove to maintain diplomatic relations with England, it was Elizabeth who recalled her ambassador from Rome and declined to receive the Papal envoy Philip befriended her during the first critical years of her reign, turned a deaf ear alike to Mary Stuart and to Irish chiefs, condoned official and unofficial assistance to his rebels in the Netherlands and was only goaded into war by the conviction that if he refrained, not only the Netherlands, but the New World, on which his finances depended, would pass out of his grasp for ever¹

We need not attempt here to follow the tangled record of how the former good relations between Spain and England came to an end It was a process of nearly thirty years It seemed that the breaking-point had been reached when, in 1569, Elizabeth seized, in Plymouth harbour, six vessels conveying treasure from the Genoese bankers for the payment of Alva's troops in the Netherlands They had taken refuge at Plymouth from the attack of a squadron of buccaneers from La Rochelle, and the Spaniards asserted that English ships were among the raiders There were reprisals by the seizure of English property in Spanish ports and counter-reprisals by the seizure of Spanish property in England The loss of the treasure led to serious troubles for Alva Relations between Spain and England were suspended, but war did not follow, and after a long period of tension diplomatic relations were resumed.

¹ A F Pollard, *The Political History of England*, vol vi, chapter x, pp 190-1 Later on (*ibid*, vol vi, chapter xx, p 373) Professor Pollard says 'Like his father, Charles V, Philip eschewed aggression, because fortune had placed in his hands quite as much as he could hope to keep, and he would have been more than satisfied to leave to his successor those possessions he had inherited This conservative ambition included a determination to retain those realms in obedience to the Roman Church, for Philip was less a *politique* than any contemporary ruler, and it was on the religious question that his efforts at accommodation with the Netherlands failed But he had no thought of forcing his faith upon the subjects of other sovereigns except by personal suasion and diplomatic representation'

The breaking-point came at last when Drake persisted in raids upon the Spanish possessions in America and Spanish shipping in the western ocean. Elizabeth had given him no full commission for these ventures, but she knighted the adventurer and shared the plunder. She, or rather the controllers of her policy were, in addition to this, openly aiding the revolt of the Netherlands, and a body of English volunteers under her favourite Leicester held Flushing and interrupted the trade of Antwerp by their control of the mouth of the Scheldt.

The rupture came at last in 1585. In the next year Philip's famous admiral, Alvaro de Bazan, marquis of Santa Cruz,¹ was in command of a fleet based on Lisbon, with orders to deal with any new ventures of Drake. The admiral and the king were in close correspondence on projects for a serious operation against England itself. Santa Cruz proposed that a huge Armada should sail from Lisbon, conveying an invading army of over 60,000 men, and he worked out every detail of the necessary organization. Philip decided that the plan was too costly and its preparations would require too much time. Eventually he adopted a more moderate scheme based on suggestions originally put forward by Don John of Austria years before. A powerful fleet was to sail up the Channel, to protect and assist in the transport of a veteran army from Flanders to invade England. It was decided that the attempt should be made in the following year (1587). Alessandro Farnese, duke of Parma, was to command the land forces. Philip, in order to give the expedition the prestige of a holy war with his Catholic subjects, secured the somewhat grudging support of the Pope, who promised a subsidy, to be paid on the reception of the news that a landing in England had actually been effected.

Early next spring, while the preparations were in progress, Drake made a dash for Cadiz and inflicted serious loss on the squadron of Andalusia which was fitting out in the harbour. This led to the whole venture being deferred till the following

¹ He had commanded the reserve squadron at Lepanto, and the Spanish fleet in the two victories of Tricceira over the partisans of the Portuguese pretender, Don Antonio. It was said he never lost a battle.

year. Santa Cruz died while the fleet was being concentrated at Lisbon, a serious loss to the enterprise.

Philip made the strange mistake of appointing as his successor Don Alonso Perez de Guzman, duke of Medina Sidonia, and head of a noble family that ranked next to the royal line itself. He had great wealth, was a splendid horseman and famous for his skill in manly sports, but he protested to the king that he knew nothing of the sea or of war and sought to resign the proffered command. But the king insisted on his accepting it, telling him he would have the best advice from the veteran soldiers and sailors who commanded the squadrons of the fleet. The most probable explanation of the king's choice is that he hoped the prestige of the great noble would be a safeguard against rivalries among the subordinate chiefs of the expedition.

The sailing of the fleet was delayed by its new commander insisting on additions to its numbers and changes in its equipment. When at last it put to sea, on the 29th May 1588, it mustered 130 sail of all classes, with 8,000 sailors and some 19,000 soldiers to man it. Officially it was known as 'The Great Armada'. This was not a boastful title, for it meant simply the great fleet or the main fleet, as Jellicoe's North Sea fleet was described in the late war as 'The Grand Fleet'. Among the many legends that have gathered round the story of the Armada, is the tradition that it was called 'The Invincible Armada'. The term was never used by the Spaniards of the day, and was apparently invented by gossip in England, after the expedition had failed.¹

Another legend is that it was a fleet of an overwhelming strength with ships of enormous size. But even the largest Spanish ships could be matched by equally heavy ships in the fleet it opposed. Its real fighting force was made up of 67 sail (63 galleons and 4 galleasses). All these were ships ranging up

¹ How little Philip regarded success as certain is shown by his instructions as to terms on which peace might be concluded if there was no complete victory, but only some partial advantage. Elizabeth was to be asked to tolerate the Catholics as the king of France tolerated the Huguenots. Flushing was to be evacuated and compensation paid for Drake's raids on the colonies, but the last point might be waived.

to about 1,000 tons in a few cases, full rigged and armed with broadside guns and lighter guns on the fore and stern castles. The galleasses had long oars as well as sails. The English fleet numbered 167 sail, but its total was swelled by a large proportion of small craft. Its larger ships were more heavily gunned than the Spanish galleons. Built for the rough weather of the northern seas and with crews used to northern conditions, and highly skilled seamen, they were able to choose their distance, and used their heavier guns to advantage against the lighter armed southern ships.

The Armada was caught in a Biscay gale and had to take refuge at Corunna to refit. It put to sea again on the 12th July, and after weathering a heavy gale off the entrance to the Channel, sighted the Lizard in Cornwall on the 20th.

The English fleet under command of Howard of Effingham and Drake was in Plymouth harbour. Pleading the necessity of obeying the king's precise orders to proceed as rapidly as possible up Channel to join Parma, without any unnecessary fighting, Medina Sidonia rejected the advice of the older commanders to attack the fleet as it came out of the port slowly against a head wind, and beat it in detail. He pushed on after a fight off Plymouth, another off Portland, and a third as he passed the Isle of Wight. His only losses were two ships, one disabled by collision, another by accidental explosion. His fleet was practically intact when the Armada anchored in Calais Roads on the 27th.

But Parma had not the army of invasion ready; he sent word from Bruges that it would be at least a week before any of his troops could embark.

Then came the beginning of disaster. On the second evening after the arrival off Calais the Armada was attacked by fireships drifting in on the rising tide. It would have been easy to grapple and beach them, and Medina Sidonia gave orders for this to be attempted. But they were supposed, by not a few of the Spaniards, to be explosion ships, like the famous 'devil ship' that three years before, during the great siege of Antwerp, had broken the Spanish floating bridge across the Scheldt, with

much loss of life. There was a panic in many ships of the Armada. They cut their cables and drifted in confusion to the eastward.

Medina Sidonia did not share the alarm. He got up his anchors and with the ships that had stood by him, rallied his fleet next morning. It was in a serious position, close in to the shallows and sandbanks of the shelving coast with a strong north-west wind driving the ships shorewards. The English attacked. Two galleons went aground, two more were sunk by gunfire. The peril seemed inevitable that every ship would be helplessly stranded, but a sudden shift of the wind to the east-south-east enabled Medina Sidonia to lead the fleet out north-east into deep water. The English did not attack as the Armada, now in good order, stood out in the North Sea.

Howard was short of ammunition for his guns, and he did not know the Spaniards were in the same case. He decided to follow them without risking another battle. Medina Sidonia held a council that afternoon, a minority wanted to remain in the North Sea in the hope that Parma might soon be ready and the weather more favourable. But the Armada was short of gunpowder and the ships were full of sick and wounded men, and many of them damaged and leaking. It was decided that, as Parma had failed to co-operate and the fleet was no longer ready for a serious action, it should return to Spain by rounding the north coast of Scotland into the Atlantic.

The English fleet followed the Armada northwards till it was off the Firth of Forth. Touch was then lost, and Howard brought his ships back to the mouth of the Thames. They, too, were full of sick and disabled men, and round Margate, farms, sheds, and tents were crowded with sick and dying men landed from the fleet. There was keen anxiety in England for some days. There was a widespread fear that the Spaniards might have gone off to Norway to refit and return. Howard wrote that if they did, he had hardly enough men left on his ships to weigh anchor and make sail. At last news came that the Armada had been sighted rounding the north of Scotland and going west. Then, and then only, talk of a great English victory began. The queen went in

state to St Paul's for a thanksgiving service, and though the persecuted Catholics had loyally supported the government during the crisis, the victory was further celebrated by taking from the prisoners a number of priests and lay recusants, among them a lady, and during three days hanging them at Tyburn and other places in and around London.

It was after it had passed westward between the Orkneys and Shetlands that the terrible disasters of the Armada began. For a while it kept together in well-ordered squadrons, working its way slowly in cold, rainy weather against easterly winds, until it was well out towards the Faroes, and then heading southward for Spain. It was now more like winter than summer. A few men kept the decks, trimming the sails and toiling at the pumps, the rest of the crews huddled below, many of them sick and dying. Stragglers in twos and threes failed to keep their stations with the fleet. Some, despite hard work at the pumps, at last sank in the Atlantic. Then came a raging south-wester blowing hard for days and nights, which strewed the Irish coasts with wrecked ships. About half of the Armada straggled into the northern ports of Spain.

Philip took instant measures to succour the victims of the disaster. When he received the first news of it he said, without a falter in his voice, that he bowed to the Will of God, Who gave or refused success according to His good pleasure. Then he added that though one Armada had failed, Spain was still rich enough to send out another. But no such attempt was made. One sufficient reason for this was that the subsequent course of events in the Netherlands would have made it impossible to employ Parma's forces on an expedition across the Narrow Seas to invade England.

In the year after the defeat of the Armada, an English counter-attack was attempted. The plan was to make a descent on the Portuguese coast and advance on Lisbon, with hopes that the partisans of the Pretender to the throne, Don Antonio, would co-operate in the enterprise. A force of 18,000 men was embarked on the fleet that sailed from Plymouth in the early spring of 1589, under the command of Drake and Norreys. There was

a landing north-west of Lisbon, some small towns were occupied and plundered; the Portuguese gave no help and in face of a concentration of superior forces the remnant of the expedition re-embarked. Only about 6,000 returned to England.¹

The war dragged on during the rest of Philip's reign, but without any decisive results on either side. Both sides were weary of the desultory conflict, when at last, under James I, peace was made between England and Spain.

The defeat of the Armada marked the beginning of a remarkable expansion of the naval power of England, but it would be a mistake to say that the naval power of Spain was broken. During the long years of war that followed 1588, the Spanish fleets were able to protect the communications of the home country with its oversea possessions despite all the efforts of their opponents.

¹ The anything but creditable story of the affair is told in interesting detail in Martin A. S. Hume's work, *The Year after the Armada*, published in 1896.

SOURCES

The chief source is Philip II's own *Correspondence* in nine volumes, edited by L P Gachard, Brussels, 1848-83. Next in importance comes the *Correspondence of Cardinal de Granvelle* (1517-86), in twelve volumes (the originals are preserved in 82 manuscript volumes in the public library at Besançon), derived from his State Papers and partly edited by Poullat and Piot, Brussels, 1877-96, in continuation of *The State Papers of Cardinal de Granvelle*, published in nine volumes by Ch Weiss, Paris, 1841-61. Then documents in archives which have been partly published, such as the Abbé Douais's edition of the *Despatches of M. de Fourquevaux*, ambassador to King Charles IX in Spain, Paris, 1896, *Don Bernardino de Mendoza's Memoirs* on the events in the Netherlands from 1567 to 1577, and the *Correspondence of William the Silent, Prince of Orange*, six volumes, Brussels, 1886 et seq. The Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, vol. xxi, part iii, edited by Mrs S C Lomas and A B Hinds, recently published by H M Stationery Office, should be referred to for a picture of Elizabethan politics and diplomacy in the year before the Great Armada. The volume opens on the 1st April 1587, less than two months after the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, and ends on the 31st December, some seven months before Medina Sidonia sailed from Corunna.

CHAPTER IV

THE THIRTY YEARS WAR. ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS

Summary 1 Germany from 1555 to 1618 2 The Defenestration of Prague
3 The Palatine interlude (1618-23) 4 The Danish period (1624-9) 5 The
Edict of Restitution, the Swedish period (1629-35) 6 The French period
(1635-48) 7 The Treaties of Westphalia

I. GERMANY FROM 1555 TO 1618

THE principal cause of the Thirty Years War is generally said to have been the frequent violation by the Lutherans in Germany of the so-called 'ecclesiastical reservation' clause incorporated in the Recess of Augsburg published on the 25th September 1555. The clause was, in fact, often disregarded between 1555 and 1618 the bishoprics of Magdeburg, Bremen, Riga, Merseburg, Naumburg, Brandenburg, and Minden were secularized. Church property became the spoil of the Lutheran princes as in the early days of the spread of Lutheranism. An event of the gravest political importance was a second attempt by an ecclesiastical elector, on this occasion Gebhard Truchsess, archbishop of Cologne, to transform his electorate into a secular principality after he had gone through a form of marriage with a nun, Agnes von Mansfeld. The scandal was enormous. Politicians in both camps became alarmed. The Lutherans were opposed to Truchsess because he professed Calvinism, a form of religion which was illegal within the Empire. The Catholics were indignant at his conduct and dreaded the loss of an electorate which might lead to the transference of the imperial crown to a Protestant prince. The apostate archbishop was forcibly expelled and Cologne remained Catholic (1583-8). The Truchsess episode was only the most notable of a series of unhappy incidents, in various places—at Aix-la-Chapelle, for example, and at Donauwörth, where religious riots broke out. The hatred between the Lutheran and the Catholic States exasperated and embittered every political conflict.

It would, however, be an error to believe that such breaches

of the pact sworn at Augsburg were the only causes of the protracted conflict which raged between 1618 and 1648. Even more important was the contrast between the policies of the Catholic principalities and the Protestant States. The latter rigorously applied the principle *Cujus regio, ejus religio*¹ and took advantage of their theologians' pretensions to be, like faithful disciples of Luther, the interpreters of the Gospel in all its purity, and to decree that practices not in conformity with the official Lutheran doctrine could not be tolerated. They declared that it was impossible for them to agree that any nobles or towns within their jurisdiction should claim the right to choose their own religion, and therefore suppressed any pretensions to religious independence.

The Catholic States had not shown the same uncompromising spirit. The Habsburg monarchy had attempted to win the nobles by a sort of broad-minded religious toleration. Lutheranism had been allowed to exert its influence in most of the Catholic States. The upper classes, which alone had the right to vote, had gone over to the new doctrines *en masse* in Bohemia, Moravia, Styria, and Austria. A great part of Hungary had gone over to Calvinism. The nobles considered a change of religion to be the easiest means of enriching themselves by the acquisition of ecclesiastical revenues and strengthening their personal position in a time of transition from the feudal régime to absolutism. Ferdinand I (1556–64) was too completely absorbed in opposing the Turkish peril to interfere with Protestantism amongst the nobles, whose support in the field was so necessary. His successor, Maximilian II (1564–76), had before his accession to the throne evinced some inclination towards Lutheranism. The Protestants took advantage of this mood to extort from him an edict authorizing the practice of Lutheran rites in castles according to the custom then prevailing in France. The nobles found it much to their advantage to cover their aspirations to independence under the cloak of religious liberty, and a profession of Lutheranism was a conveniently conscient-

¹ The principle according to which the ruler of a State has the right to decide what shall be the religion of its inhabitants.

tious plea for the refusal of a too precise obedience to a Catholic Emperor. Even Calvinism might be used as an excuse for independence in places from which Geneva was farther distant than Vienna. The provincial diets continued to grow in power and prevented any effective reassertion of the Imperial authority.

Nevertheless the persistent efforts of the Catholics, ably led by the Society of Jesus, and especially those of Peter Canisius, began at last to turn the scale. The Jesuits found powerful allies in the Capuchins in the work of the Catholic counter-offensive in Austria, Styria, Moravia, and even in Bohemia, a country which was most deeply affected by the new doctrine. Great results would certainly have been obtained if only there had been on the throne an Emperor capable of making some show of energy. Rudolph II, however, the successor of Maximilian II (1576-1612), was as devoid of will as he was incapable of any breadth of view. Jealous for his authority and surrounding himself entirely with courtiers of humble origin, he cared little for the responsibilities of his office, but instead devoted his time to researches in alchemy and astronomical observations under the tutelage of the learned Tycho-Brahé. He soon became an object of derision and contempt in every part of the Empire.

An attempt in 1604 to insert a clause against Protestantism in the decrees passed at the Hungarian Diet of Pressburg roused the whole of Hungary in arms against him under the leadership of Stephen Bocskay. The Turks took advantage of the rebellion to intervene in the affairs of Hungary and conclude an alliance with the rebels. The Empire was exposed to such a peril that the archdukes, brothers and cousins of Rudolph, held several family councils to compel the Emperor to take the steps they considered necessary for the common safety. He was forced against his will to allow Hungary to be governed by his brother Matthias, who secured peace but only by making the largest concessions to Bocskay and the Turks. Rudolph protested against this as a mere surrender, but the only result was that Austria and Moravia joined forces with Hungary and agreed thenceforth to acknowledge no other authority than that of

Matthias. But Matthias found himself once more compelled to grant the largest measure of religious liberty to his new subjects. All that Rudolph succeeded in retaining was Bohemia and the title of Emperor. The success of the rebels, however, roused the envy of the Bohemian Protestants, who, with the secret support of Matthias, revolted against Rudolph and wrung from him the 'Letters of Majesty', *Litterae Majestaticae* (1609), which also accorded the most extensive religious liberty. The following year Matthias took advantage of the fresh difficulties raised by the malcontents against the government of Rudolph to annex Bohemia also from his brother, so that all that remained to Rudolph was the castle of Prague, a pension of 300,000 florins, and the title of Emperor.

The death in 1612 of the incapable Rudolph left Matthias alone in power. The government of the new Emperor, however, was no more resolute or successful. He had to choose between abandoning the rights and privileges of sovereignty and a policy of rigorous repression. The Czechs, under cover of religious liberty, were aiming above all at political independence. A reaction had begun in favour of the feudal régime. The 'Letters of Majesty' authorized the nobles to appoint *Defensores Fidei* charged with the duty of seeing to the execution of the edict. These *Defensores* proceeded to claim the additional right of holding diets without the king's previous authorization, of mobilizing the army whenever they thought fit, and concluding treaties with neighbouring countries, Silesia, Saxony, the Palatinate, and Brandenburg, 'for the defence and maintenance of the reformed religion'. Then, without waiting for the royal authorization, they entered into negotiations in Hungary, in the hereditary duchies, and in Germany with the Protestants and malcontents of all kinds whom they found readily disposed to help them against the government of Matthias.

The open revolt of Bohemia was the immediate prelude to the conflict which was to ravage Germany for thirty years. The Czechs fought for their national independence with marvellous energy, pertinacity, and obstinacy. They were determined to shake off the German yoke, and it seemed for a moment as

though their effort would be crowned with success. But the individual influence of one man, Ferdinand of Styria, who has been called the Philip II of Austria, reimposed the yoke upon them for three centuries more, just as they had come within sight of the goal of their ambition.

Ferdinand of Styria was born on the 9th July 1578, at Gratz, the son of Charles, duke of Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, the brother of the Emperor Maximilian II. He was, therefore, on his father's side a first cousin of Matthias and on his mother's side of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. He had been a fellow pupil with Duke Maximilian and received a sound education at the Jesuit university of Ingolstadt, where the memory of Canisius was still a living influence, and it was to the Jesuits that he ever afterwards ascribed the fervour of his religious faith.

Ferdinand was imbued with an ardent, enlightened, and well-founded Catholic faith which disregarded worldly opinion and had acquired the conviction that the successes achieved by the Protestants were due not so much to the doctrinal power of their faith as to their audacity and the weakness of the Catholic princes. He was determined, to the utmost of his power, to show the same active zeal in the defence of his own religion as so many Lutheran princes had displayed in advancing the cause of Protestantism.

The sincerity of his religious convictions was apparent also in his declaration that he 'would rather live in exile, begging his bread from door to door, and expose himself to every kind of outrage, even to the loss of his life, than suffer an insult to true religion'. His was a resolute character, of precise views and well-defined plans, with a will firmly set to attain his object. The study he had made of the history of his time had impressed him with the conviction, which for the period was solidly based on fact, 'that Protestantism and rebellion were inseparable and that liberty of conscience was claimed merely as an excuse for attacking the civil power'.

What he could not admit was that the *jus reformati*, that is to say, the right exercised by the least of the Lutheran princes of compelling their subjects to embrace the Lutheran religion, should be denied to the Catholic princes. He was as determined to be as much master of his household as the dissenters were in theirs, and on taking possession, in 1596, at the age of sixteen, of

his duchy of Styria, he resolved to rid it of Protestantism, and in pursuit of this purpose he at once laid claim to that absolute power at which every prince in Europe was then aiming. When he made his Easter Communion that year in Gratz, his capital, he found that he was the only communicant according to the Catholic rite. Five years later, the duchy had become completely Catholic again. Ferdinand had taken forcible measures to achieve this result, he had shut up Protestant churches and expelled the pastors, reformed the schools, and given his subjects the summary option of choosing between the faith and exile.

It would, however, appear that Ferdinand made no larger claims than were normally made by the princes of the time and that the methods adopted in Styria had not raised sufficient opposition to alarm the Czechs, otherwise it is difficult to understand why they should have accepted almost unanimously on the 19th June 1616, as an eventual successor to Matthias and future king of Bohemia, a man of absolute temperament and notorious for his friendship with the Jesuits.

Soon after the Protestant party among the Czechs, who had been caught unprepared at the time of Ferdinand's election, rose in revolt. Matthias surrendered to Ferdinand the Bohemian crown in 1617 and that of Hungary in the following year. On the death of the Emperor in 1619, Ferdinand succeeded to the imperial throne. Throughout all those years the Protestant Czechs continued in open revolt.

To complete this picture of the causes of the war it should be added that the Protestant forces had been associated since 1608 in an 'Evangelical Union' which recalled the former Schmalkaldic League in every particular, while the Catholics, who were beginning to react vigorously against the encroachments of their enemies, had formed in 1609 a Holy Catholic League as a sequel to the capture by Duke Maximilian of Bavaria of Donauworth, which had been placed under the ban of the Empire for outrages against the Catholic religion. It was a counterpart of the League of the French Catholics against the Huguenots.

2 THE DEFENESTRATION OF PRAGUE

Ferdinand of Styria had two objects in view in assuming the reins of government in Bohemia—the restoration of the royal authority, which was threatened by the independence of the nobles, and the suppression, if possible, of the new doctrines which were used as a support for such independence. There was now so much gunpowder everywhere strewn about that a spark from any quarter might have been expected to cause a formidable explosion.

The Utraquists¹ had erected a church on land belonging to the abbey of Braunau (in the north-eastern part of Bohemia) and another at Klostergrab on the territory of the archbishop of Prague, in both cases without authorization. The two ecclesiastical nobles concerned considered that such a proceeding was unwarranted by the 'Letters of Majesty', and had the illegal churches razed to the ground. The dissenters immediately addressed an indignant protest and complaint to the Emperor Matthias and claimed compensation for the loss they had suffered. Behind the feeble Matthias, however, stood the stalwart Ferdinand of Styria. The Protestant claims were rejected, and the claimants were informed that while the 'Letters of Majesty' authorized States (that is to say quasi-sovereign nobles or towns) to erect churches, such a privilege was not accorded to *subjects* without permission from their overlords.

On the receipt of the king's reply the *Defensores* convoked the estates at Prague. This assembly met on the 5th March 1618, and the energetic count of Thurn placed himself at the head of the movement. He addressed a letter of protest to the Emperor, and Ferdinand once more dictated the reply. It was sent not to the estates but to the lieutenant-governors of Bohemia, and merely ordered the delegates to break up immediately as their assembly was illegal. The royal answer was held to be a challenge. The count of Thurn led the delegates to the castle, and after a violent dispute two governors, Slawata and Martinitz,

¹ i.e. those who believed in the teaching of Huss, according to which communion *sub utraque specie*—in both kinds—was necessary to salvation.

and the Secretary of State, Fabricius, were thrown out of the window into the dry moat of the castle. They fell some fifty or sixty feet on to heaps of scrap paper and escaped with their lives (23rd May 1618).

The rebels then seized the castle, elected a provisional government of thirty directors, ten from each estate, imposed an oath on all the officials, expelled the Jesuits from the country, and raised a mercenary army under the command of the count of Thurn. The war had begun.

3. THE PALATINE INTERLUDE (1618-23)

The Bohemian insurgents were inevitably compelled to look for allies outside their own country. A civil war in such circumstances was bound to develop first into an imperial and then into a European war. It began as a religious war—and quickly turned into a political war.

The most formidable Catholic power in Europe was still Spain. Philip III, the son and successor of Philip II, promptly showed his sympathy for Ferdinand II, who at the time had just succeeded Matthias, by granting him a subsidy which enabled him to raise 10,000 men and sending him from the Netherlands a force of 8,000 soldiers.

The Czechs, on the other hand, appealed to the Evangelical Union, then controlled by a Calvinist prince, the Elector Palatine, Frederick V, a son-in-law of James I of England. The Spanish contingents had no sooner begun to march than the elector prepared to support the Czechs. He opposed with all his energy the election of Ferdinand as Emperor at Frankfort, and though he was unable to prevent this, yet succeeded in getting himself elected king of Bohemia by the Diet of Bohemia, at Prague on the same day, 28th August 1619, as that on which Ferdinand became Emperor. As a king he cut a poor figure ('the Winter King' they called him, in derision, after his flight to Holland in the winter of 1620), for he possessed neither energy nor courage. These, however, were supplied by his wife, who made up with her own for the ambition which he lacked, publicly declaring that she would rather eat sauerkraut

in the company of a king than roast beef at the table of an elector

These grave developments were a direct menace to the Habsburgs, who found themselves faced with a problem of life or death. The king of Bohemia was also an elector, and the question was whether a Calvinist could be allowed to enjoy two votes in the imperial college of electors. The elector of Brandenburg had also just embraced Calvinism. If Frederick's claim were allowed the Calvinists would then have three votes against one Lutheran (that of the elector of Saxony) and three Catholic (those of the ecclesiastical electors).

Confronted with such a dangerous situation, the Emperor hastened to secure the assistance of his cousin, the powerful duke of Bavaria, a zealous Catholic and the only prince at the time in possession of a national standing army. The Holy League would be mobilized to a man behind Maximilian of Bavaria. An interview took place between the two sovereigns at Munich. Maximilian agreed to take command of the military operations against Bohemia in return for his expenses, but stipulated for the immediate cession of upper Austria as a guarantee.

Ferdinand II came to a similar understanding with the Lutheran elector, John George of Saxony, who, through hatred of Calvinism and fear of the preponderance of the Palatinate, promised his help to the Emperor in return for the immediate cession of Lusatia. Thus even the allies of the Habsburgs took precautions to safeguard themselves against the aggrandizement of a house whose immoderate ambition had been a source of anxiety to Germany ever since the time of Charles V.

Ferdinand's diplomatic triumphs ensured his victory in the field. The troops of the Holy League, led by Maximilian of Bavaria and supported by the famous Count Tilly, crushed the Czechs at the battle of the White Hill to the west of Prague on the 8th November 1620. Frederick V fled in such haste that he left the insignia of royalty and his crown behind him in the public square and sought safety in Holland. It looked as though the war were over. Ferdinand returned in triumph to Prague.

But he had still his allies to pay, and to that end sought compensation from the guilty party. If upper Austria and Lusatia were not to be handed over to the Bavarian duke and the Saxon elector, Ferdinand's debts to them must be redeemed by gains made at the expense of the Elector-Palatine, and for this purpose he did not hesitate to commit an unconstitutional act. The guilty elector was only answerable for his conduct to the electoral college and the sovereign diet; Ferdinand was bold enough to invoke the opinion of the Aulic Council, whose authority was valid only so far as Austrian affairs were concerned. The Council not unnaturally delivered an opinion favourable to his designs. Ferdinand thereupon on his own authority declared Frederick V under the ban of the Empire, a sentence of outlawry which deprived the elector of all his political and civil rights with for inevitable consequence the confiscation of his property.

This was the act of an absolute sovereign deliberately resolved to transform the imperial power into a highly centralized authority similar to that exercised by the kings of France and Spain. It meant, as all well knew, the renewal of the war, but Ferdinand acted thus with the connivance of Bavaria and the Holy League. Tilly, a general of the first rank, bred in the school of the duke of Alva and Alessandro Farnese, and a zealous Catholic, undertook to carry out the imperial decree. The Evangelical Union had only two active adventurers to set up against him, Ernest von Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick. Tilly defeated them one after the other. The former was forced to flee to Hungary; the latter was crushed at Stadtlohn in the diocese of Munster (4th–6th August 1623). The conquest of the Palatinate was complete.

Ferdinand meanwhile perpetrated a second illegality. He assembled a diet at Ratisbon in 1623 and proposed the transference of the electoral privilege from the Elector-Palatine to the duke of Bavaria, to whom he had secretly promised it. The Protestants, including the elector of Saxony, vigorously opposed such a suggestion. Ferdinand paid no attention to their objections, and on the 25th February 1623 declared that

Bavaria should take the place of the Palatinate as an electoral territory.

The balance had been disturbed once by the election of the Palatine as king of Bohemia. This time it was disturbed in the opposite direction. The Protestants considered themselves injured. The Emperor's absolutist ambitions drove them to seek for foreign allies as in the days of the Schmalkaldic League. The war was about to enter a new phase that of the Danish intervention.

4 THE DANISH INTERVENTION (1624-9)

There can be no doubt that the Protestant princes had from the beginning considered with apprehension the prospect of being compelled to restore the ecclesiastical property which they had seized. Two archbishoprics, twelve bishoprics, one hundred and twenty abbacies had been confiscated since 1555. Their Evangelical Union had been destroyed by the crushing defeat of the Palatine. They therefore addressed themselves to Christian, king of Denmark, a prince of no small ability. Christian had succeeded to the throne in 1588 at the age of eleven and after a solid preparation had taken the reins of government into his own hands in 1596. His rule had been from the earliest days beneficent and wise. He had rebuilt and renamed¹ Christiana the capital of Norway, developed the Danish fleet, the trade of the country and its colonial empire, organized the army, and shown himself an enlightened patron of the arts and sciences.

The delegates of Lower Saxony had appointed him their 'Colonel' and the defender of their interests against the Emperor. On the 25th May 1624 he accepted the offer made to him. The Bohemian war which had been originally an Austrian and later developed into an imperial war now became a foreign and European war. Its religious element still existed, for King Christian was a Lutheran coming to the help of his co-religionists. The political aspect, however, tended to become

¹ The city had been originally known as Oslo. Built mostly of wood, it was completely destroyed by a fire. Christian rebuilt it. In our time it has resumed its original name.

predominant and a new event succeeded in drawing the attention of all Europe to the internal affairs of Germany—the formation of Wallenstein's army.

The army of the Holy League was weak in comparison with the Danish army Ferdinand, moreover, was well aware that his allies gave nothing for nothing, and he had found the assistance of Maximilian and his army too heavy a burden to bear. There was nothing, therefore, which he welcomed with greater alacrity than the offer made to him by the famous adventurer Count Albrecht von Waldstein (corrupted into Wallenstein) to raise an army of 40,000 men at his own expense, without its costing the Emperor a penny, on the sole condition that Wallenstein should have the appointment of all the officers. Ferdinand had long been acquainted with this strange, romantic character, sprung from a noble but not wealthy Bohemian family, a convert to Catholicism by the Jesuits of Olmutz, but nevertheless addicted to astrology and fain to read in the stars of the glorious career which was reserved for him. He had already distinguished himself in the Bohemian war, and in 1622 had been appointed to the command of the troops at Prague. Wallenstein was a bold, unscrupulous leader who ruled his troops with a rod of iron, but induced them to follow him by the prospect of adventure and booty. The Emperor accepted the *condottiere's* proposals and conferred on him the title of duke of Friedland with the full powers he claimed.

Wallenstein was not long in raising the army he had promised. It was an association of adventurers of all sorts from every country drawn together by his military reputation and their own cupidity.

This armed help was a factor of the first importance. Hitherto the Emperor had no army he could call his own. He could not raise a soldier or a subsidy without the intervention of the diet. Now he was at the head of an imposing army which cost him nothing and could maintain itself indefinitely on the one condition of being always engaged in war, for it was an axiom with Wallenstein that 'war should feed war'. Such an army was not only a formidable power but a perpetual menace to its

neighbours, for the temptation was strong to the owner of such an instrument to keep it in constant use, and the more so because events proved Wallenstein to be right. War, provided it is successful and on not too enormous a scale, does feed the army engaged in it. Wastage is made good after every victory and recruits are abundant. Ernest von Mansfeld was defeated at the battle of the Dessau bridge (1626). Wallenstein then reduced the elector of Brandenburg to submission and overran Mecklenburg and Pomerania. His army, meanwhile, instead of diminishing, doubled its numbers. It reckoned 80,000, possibly 100,000, effectives, some accounts state that there were as many as 160,000 mercenaries in the ranks, but this must be an exaggeration. Wallenstein failed at the siege of Stralsund (24th July 1628), which was stoutly defended by the Swedes, who had been frightened into war early in that same year by the menace of Wallenstein's appearance on the Baltic coast, but, on the other hand, Christian of Denmark's last army, which had already been defeated by Tilly at Lutter (27th August 1628), was utterly destroyed at Wolgast in August 1628. The duchies of Holstein and Schleswig, even Jutland, were in the hands of the imperial troops. Christian resigned himself to signing the Treaty of Lubeck, by which he bound himself not to assist the Protestants of Germany (22nd May 1629). The Emperor was triumphant all along the line—but not for long. The flowing tide of success soon turned against him.

5 THE EDICT OF RESTITUTION—THE SWEDISH PERIOD (1629–35)

Ferdinand felt himself master of the situation, and early in 1629 disclosed his intentions with regard to the restoration of the Catholic Church in Germany. On the 6th March he published the Edict of Restitution, thereby intimating a return to a strict observance of the Treaty of Augsburg of 1555 and more particularly of the famous 'ecclesiastical reservations' clause. He insisted on the Protestant princes immediately surrendering all property belonging to the Church which they had usurped since 1552. Ferdinand was justified in strict law, but this sudden resurrection of the imperial authority after its

long slumber could not fail to arouse such anxiety in the minds of the Protestants as was bound to provoke a rising *en masse* against the proposed measure. It would have been more prudent to invite the diet to suggest the interpretation to be given to the treaty of 1555 and such penalties as might be usefully imposed in the event of its non-observance. The Emperor, however, acted on his own authority. Wallenstein at the same time used threatening language, declaring that the Emperor 'ought to be master in his own household as the kings of France and Spain are in theirs', that 'the bishops ought to be restricted in Germany as in Italy to the exercise of their spiritual authority alone', and that 'there is no need of electors or princes, the election of the king of the Romans is a useless, idle ceremony, and the Emperor's son should succeed his father by inheritance'. Everybody then realized that Wallenstein was more than ever in the confidence of the Emperor, who conferred on him the title of Admiral of the Baltic Seas and Oceans. This was a threat to Sweden, which since 1611 had been governed by a king whose energy equalled his ambition and who was also a first-rate soldier.

At the same time French diplomacy in the masterful hands of a man of genius, Cardinal de Richelieu, began to take a hand in the game. Richelieu had already crossed the path of the Habsburgs in the matter of the Valtelline in 1624–6 and the duchies of Mantua and Monteferrat (1627). Free of the Huguenots since the capture of La Rochelle (1627) and court intrigues since the 'Day of Dupes' (11th November 1630), the famous cardinal, with the staunch support of his king, began to devote himself entirely to the struggle against the house of Habsburg, established both in Madrid, where he specially dreaded it, and in Vienna, where its pretensions also caused him anxiety. His agents in many cases were, like those of Charles V, religious, more particularly the Capuchin friars. Richelieu had the Faith to the marrow of his bones. Yet, sincere Catholic that he was, it never occurred to him, as under the evil influence of nationalism it never occurs to so many sincere Catholics of every nationality, that in shaping his country's foreign policy it

was his duty to look to the general welfare of Christendom rather than to the political advantage of his own country He therefore allied himself with the Protestants, and the reigning Pope (Cardinal Maffeo Barberini had succeeded Gregory XV in August 1623, and taken the name of Urban VIII), anxious to avoid, if possible, taking sides in a conflict between two Catholic princes, refused to condemn the Protestant alliances of Richelieu

Richelieu's first step was to conclude a treaty against Spain with the United Provinces (17th June 1630). The intention was to confine the king of Spain to the Netherlands and so prevent him from interfering in the Empire. The cardinal's agents had for some years been at work to influence Maximilian of Bavaria, who was exasperated by the methods of Wallenstein and the contempt which the Emperor had shown for his army by preferring that adventurer to Tilly Richelieu finally sent Hercule de Charnacé as his ambassador to offer Gustavus Adolphus the part which Christian of Denmark had played so badly and the promise of heavy subsidies Charnacé began by negotiating on a basis of mutual concessions a truce for six years between Sweden and Poland who were at war (Altmark, 26th September 1629), but his mission to Gustavus Adolphus ended in failure It was not that the king of Sweden was averse from making war on the Emperor but rather that he was unwilling to accept the conditions laid down by France, namely to compel the king of Spain to withdraw his troops from Germany and to respect the rights of the Catholics, and more particularly the duke of Bavaria. Gustavus for commercial reasons was unwilling to offend the Spaniards, and he did not want to embroil himself with England, which was supporting the Palatine against Bavaria His reason for refusing French gold was, in short, to keep his hands free. Gustavus disembarked on the coast of Pomerania on the 4th July 1630, at the very moment that the Emperor was holding a diet at Ratisbon The States, Catholic and Protestant alike, had insisted that Wallenstein should be dismissed, and on the 13th August Ferdinand gave way The general withdrew

to his Bohemian domains and the Emperor informed all the heads of the regiments in his army that its commander-in-chief had been dismissed.

An error of tactics committed by Richelieu's envoys at the diet made the French effort ineffective for a time. But Richelieu, whose agents had exceeded their master's instructions, still continued to negotiate with Gustavus Adolphus. The king of Sweden, having overrun Pomerania, must have formed a more exact appreciation of the task before him, for he accepted on the 13th January 1631 the offer of Charnacé which he had refused the year before. In return for an annual subsidy of one million pounds he pledged himself to maintain in Germany for five years an army of 30,000 foot and 6,000 horse, to respect the Catholic religion wherever practised, and also, but on condition of reciprocity, to respect the neutrality of the Catholic League (Treaty of Barwalde).

Gustavus Adolphus, however, in his turn was too successful in the field for Richelieu's liking. On the 17th September 1631 he defeated Tilly's army at the great battle of Breitenfeld, a couple of miles north-east of Leipzig, marched on the Rhine, installed himself handsomely among the Catholic population, and captured in succession Wurzburg, Mainz, Speyer, Worms, and Mannheim (1631-2). He may perhaps have dreamed of founding a German Protestant Empire with himself as Emperor. He even proposed to Richelieu that together they should attack Franche-Comté, Luxembourg, Flanders, and Alsace. The conquest of these provinces was indeed part of Richelieu's designs, for he had exposed in a celebrated interview in 1629 the objects of his foreign policy when he declared that he would have France extend to the boundaries of Gaul. But on the advice of the Père Joseph, his intimate confidant—*l'Eminence grise*—the cardinal refused, not without an interior struggle, to betray the interests of the Catholic religion as the price of acquisitions so precious to his country. He would, in effect, have had to surrender to Gustavus the ecclesiastical electors, the Holy League, and Bavaria. Richelieu was also much too astute to favour the creation at the door of even a greater France of

a powerful Lutheran empire. Weary of the successes of 'the Goth', he ceased to pay him his subsidy, and endeavoured, but without success, to keep him at the gates of Bavaria, which threw itself into the arms of the Emperor.

Gustavus Adolphus was killed that same year at the battle of Lutzen on the 16th November 1632, fought against Wallenstein, whom Ferdinand had been forced to recall. It was now of supreme importance not to leave the German Protestants defenceless against the Emperor, who had suddenly been placed in such a favourable position by the death of the king of Sweden. Richelieu's intention was to oppose the elector of Saxony to Ferdinand. But Oxenstierna, the chancellor of Sweden, who assumed control of the government during the minority of Queen Christina, was able to persuade the French ambassador that he was capable of carrying on the task which his dead master had begun. Oxenstierna also enlisted the confidence and support of four German circles (the Assembly of Heilbronn, 13th April 1633), and, by the Treaty of Frankfort of the 5th September following, Sweden, France, the circles of the Upper and the Lower Rhine, Swabia, and Franconia formed a solid alliance against the Emperor. Bavaria meanwhile detached itself from France. Wallenstein, who mistrusted the Emperor's intentions towards him, entered into relations with Richelieu, and the cardinal, it was rumoured, promised him a million livres a year and the title of king of Bohemia in return for his undertaking to join the confederates. But Wallenstein's treachery became known in his camp, a number of his officers conspired against him, and he was assassinated at Eger on the 25th February 1634.¹

His army passed into the hands of Ferdinand of Hungary, son of the Emperor, who marched to the succour of Bavaria, which was being ravaged by the Swedes. Reinforced by a Spanish army he gained an overwhelming victory over Horn and Bernard of Saxe-Weimar, the Swedish generals, at Nord-

¹ Those who were prominent in the actual assassination were an Irish Catholic and two Scottish Presbyterian officers—a fact interesting if only as showing the very mixed composition of Wallenstein's army.

lingen on the 5th–6th September 1634. Two other German circles, Upper and Lower Saxony, in a panic placed themselves under the protection of Sweden and France. Bernard of Saxe-Weimar had soon collected another army of 80,000 men. But the diplomacy of Ferdinand II was fortunate enough to break up a part of the coalition. On the 30th May he signed with the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt the Treaty of Prague, whereby all property secularized before 1527 was to remain in the hands of its Protestant owners for a period of forty years. Such a concession on the part of the Emperor was so important that the situation was suddenly reversed. Most of the princes and the towns, weary of the presence of foreigners in Germany, became parties to the Treaty of Prague.

Richelieu realized the danger to which this German reconciliation exposed his country. France would be isolated between the two branches of the house of Austria. It was therefore essential at all costs to maintain the alliance with Holland and Sweden. Fortunately for the cardinal's policy, Oxenstierna's hatred of the Empire was tenacious. The Treaty of Compiègne was concluded between Sweden and France a month before the signing of the Treaty of Prague, so well was Richelieu informed of the diplomatic secrets of his enemies. It provided that neither country should make a separate peace, that religious worship should be restored in Germany to the state in which it was in 1618, and that Sweden should receive the electorate of Mainz and the bishopric of Worms. 'Richelieu had on this occasion entered into arrangements clearly detrimental to the interests of Catholicity in Europe. Political gains now dominated his policy. He thought for a while of abandoning his Protestant allies, but at a price; he offered Ferdinand to disown them if Alsace were handed over to France, which would thus obtain a footing on the Rhine.' When he entered into the formal alliance with Sweden he still avoided a declaration of war with the Emperor. But he sent a herald to Brussels on the 19th May 1635 to proclaim a state of hostility to the Cardinal Infante and the king of Spain.

6. THE FRENCH PERIOD (1635-48)

War was begun on the French side by a vigorous renewal of diplomatic intrigues. The Treaty of Rivoli, concluded on the 11th July 1635, bound France, Savoy, Modena, Parma, and Mantua together against Spain; the Treaty of St Germain-en-Laye, on the 26th October following, secured for France the services of the able general Bernard of Saxe-Weimar, with an army of 12,000 foot and 6,000 horse, in return for a heavy subsidy; the truce between Poland and Sweden was renewed for a further twenty-six years. An earlier treaty, signed on the 8th February 1635, bound France and Holland closely together in an anticipatory division between them of the Spanish Netherlands and a promise of independence to such of the Belgian towns as should spontaneously have shaken off the Spanish rule.

An unsuccessful attack on Dôle and Franche-Comté in 1636 had brought Richelieu an official declaration of war from the Emperor. But the French army, although numbering 130,000 foot and 20,000 horse, was in such a poor state that Richelieu had some time to wait before military success came to the support of his diplomacy. He had no Louvois at hand to organize his army. France was invaded in the north by the Spaniards, who penetrated as far as Corbie, while the imperial troops advanced to St Jean-de-Losne. In 1637, however, the situation was restored in favour of France, which gained Artois in the north, and owing to a revolt in Catalonia, Roussillon in the south. The series of victories was completed in 1642 by the capture of Perpignan.

Bernard of Saxe-Weimar, meanwhile, had gone from success to success in Germany and taken the town of Breisach, 17th December 1638. He, too, was becoming a source of embarrassment to Richelieu on account of the vast ambitions inspired in him by his victories. But his death on the 11th July 1639, in his thirty-fifth year, changed the situation. Guébriant, who commanded the French contingent under Bernard's orders, succeeded in winning over the whole army—and with it all the left bank of the Rhine. In north-east Germany the Swedes

were still busily engaged. Oxenstierna had abandoned the idea of creating a Lutheran empire for the less ambitious project of turning the Baltic into a Swedish lake. He applied himself energetically to the conquest of Pomerania, and on the Emperor's refusal to cede it to him confirmed his alliance with France by the Treaty of Hamburg (15th March 1638).

The Emperor Ferdinand II died in 1637. His son Ferdinand III quickly grew tired of the war, in which he had played a distinguished part, but which threatened to go on for ever. He took the initiative in negotiating terms of peace. The French plenipotentiaries met his envoys at Hamburg, and on the 25th December 1641 signed a preliminary agreement appointing Munster as a place for the discussion of terms between France and the Empire, and Osnabrück as a rendezvous for a conference between the Empire and Sweden. The discussion was fixed to begin on the 25th March 1642, though there was no armistice. When Richelieu died on the 4th December following, he had reason to believe that peace was imminent. Six years, however, were still to elapse before it was definitely concluded. The plenipotentiaries did not arrive until March 1644, and from then until 1648 the course of operations ceaselessly modified by its successive alterations their opposing pretensions and proposals. The French victories under Condé at Rocroi and Lens enabled claims to be made for annexation from the Spanish Netherlands. The victories of Freiburg (1644) and Nordlingen (1645) under Turenne and Condé together, the victory of Zusmarshausen, a few miles north-west of Augsburg, in May 1648, under Turenne alone, and the capture of Prague in July 1648 by the Swedes, placed the Emperor in a most unfavourable position when at last the celebrated Treaties of Westphalia were signed on the 24th October 1648. They were to settle frontiers of Europe for a century and a half and therefore may be considered in some detail.

7 THE TREATIES OF WESTPHALIA

The conflicting interests in issue at Munster and Osnabrück were complex in the extreme. Nothing less was involved than

the attempt to establish a German and a European equilibrium. As far as Germany was concerned, the enemies of the Empire were anxious to restrict the power of the Emperor within the narrowest limits and establish a religious truce which might be permanent. The problems pressing for solution were serious: what was to be done with the Elector Palatine who had been dispossessed since 1624? What was to be done about the title of elector which had been granted to the duke of Bavaria? The most striking feature in the long, laborious discussions at Munster was the unbridled desire exhibited by the German princes for independence from the Emperor, the policy already described as 'German particularism'. In the interests of the French predominance Richelieu (and Mazarin after him) was anxious to perpetuate the divisions of Germany—and this 'particularism', while it constituted the irremediable weakness of the Empire and had been greatly increased by the Lutheran revolution, had also proved of the highest advantage to France in the time of Charles V. It was also destined to ensure that preponderance of France in Europe under the reign of Louis XIV, the desire for the continuance of which caused French diplomacy at all times do its utmost to destroy any attempt at centralization and absolutism on the part of the Emperor.

When France and Sweden on the 11th June 1645 presented their first definite proposals, it was observed that the only point on which they were completely agreed was that of the political independence of every German State. They were determined to continue the policy of the Schmalkaldic League which they had found so profitable. The religious question was relegated to the background in the treaties: politics had taken the first place. The territorial claims of the allies were the chief bone of contention throughout the discussions. Sweden claimed the two Pomeranias, the archbishopric of Bremen, and the bishopric of Verden: France demanded Alsace. The diplomatic wrangle over these proposals lasted from the 11th June 1645 until the 24th October 1648, three years and four months.

It must also be observed that, for all their pedantry and

solemnity, their lengthy speeches, and the gravity with which they developed their arguments, the plenipotentiaries of the day were people of common sense. They were under no illusion that it was possible for them to settle the fate of the world for ever. Their objects were two—to secure to the victors the advantages of victory and to adjust, at any rate provisionally, the unstable equilibrium between the powers. If later the equilibrium thus set up collapsed, it would be the business of other diplomats to restore it. It has been said of the Congress that its members 'did not seek to do what might be just but what was possible.'

Meanwhile a separate peace had been concluded between Spain and Holland on the 30th January 1648. Spain felt that she was on the point of being abandoned by the Emperor, while she was anxious to take the opportunity presented by the troubles of the Fronde which had just broken out in France to be revenged on that country. Here, too, political aims got the better of religious antagonism, and Spain therefore concluded an agreement with Holland in order to have her hands free against France. Holland, on the other hand, found the costs of the war a heavy burden to bear, and weary of the preponderance assumed by the military party in a nation of traders, preferred, after due consideration, that the Catholic Netherlands should be under the domination of the Spaniards rather than under the rule of a powerful France. Spain therefore withdrew from the Congress, which then proceeded to consider how the affairs of the Empire should be settled, disregarding the prospect of a general peace which was not to be restored until the Treaty of the Pyrenees was signed in 1659.

Two points in the Treaty of Westphalia require careful consideration (*a*) the settlement of affairs in Germany, and (*b*) the settlement of relations between Sweden and France on the one hand and the Empire on the other.

(*a*) *The Settlement of Affairs in Germany* An indication of the order in importance in which questions presented themselves at the time to Protestant and Catholic alike may be found in the fact that the religious interests were postponed to territorial

considerations and regarded mainly from the territorial and political point of view.

Religious questions were settled by Article V of Part I. Clause 1 re-established the Passau agreement and the Peace of Augsburg (1552-5). Clause 2 confirmed all secularizations which had taken place before the 1st January 1624. Clause 3 maintained 'ecclesiastical reservations' for the future. Clause 12 provided that dissenting forms of worship (Lutheranism in Catholic countries and Catholicism in Lutheran countries) should enjoy *public liberty* to the same extent as it had been accorded in 1624 and *private liberty* or toleration for all.

A clause was added to Article VII as follows 'Every provision in these presents in favour of the adherents to the Augsburg Confession shall be taken to include also the members of the *reformed* (Calvinist) religion such is the *unanimous* opinion of the States'. The word '*unanimous*' was not in fact exact, for the elector of Saxony, a Lutheran, consistent to the last, protested against this clause and strove his utmost to exclude the Calvinists from the concessions made to the Lutherans.

The year 1624 was adopted as the binding normal year, but not until after a protracted and bitter discussion. The allies had suggested 1618, the date of the outbreak of the war. The imperial delegates wanted 1627, the year in which the balance of advantage weighed most heavily on their side. The difference was split and a compromise effected by taking 1624 for religious and 1619 for territorial questions. A concession was thereby rendered possible to the heirs of the Count Palatine. The question of the Palatinate being one of the most important was settled by Article IV of the Treaty of Osnabrück, which also included the aforementioned provisions.

Article IV left the duke of Bavaria with the Upper Palatinate and the dignity of an Elector Palatine, but it created an eighth electorate, unlike the old Palatine electorate and not entitling the possessor of it to the same privileges and honours, in favour of Louis, Count Palatine of the Rhine, and his heirs, who were restored to the possession of the lower Palatinate and its dependencies.

Of the other territorial changes in Germany the most notable were the following the house of Brandenburg (Hohenzollern) acquired eastern Pomerania and abandoned western Pomerania to Sweden. It also received the bishoprics of Halberstadt, Minden, Kamin, and the reversion of the bishopric of Magdeburg. The future of that house was inscribed on the map of its possessions which stretched from the Rhine (the duchy of Cleves) to Pomerania and the frontiers of Poland. Its object thenceforth was to consolidate and cement its property.

The house of Austria, on the other hand, lost Alsace to France, but strengthened itself within Germany. It acquired absolute control of Bohemia and concentrated on the Danube. Its constituent States, which had suffered little from the war, were now able to increase in prosperity. The position of the Emperor, however, as defined in Article VIII, was shorn of much of its dignity and importance. He became powerless to make war or peace, to change a garrison or to build a fortress, to enact a law, to impose a tax, or to declare any one under the ban of the Empire without the consent of the States. Each State, on the other hand, was to have the right to conclude an alliance with its neighbours or foreigners on the sole condition that any alliance so contracted should not be directed against the Emperor or the Empire or in violation of the Treaty of Westphalia itself. Every prince was given the *jus reformandi* and the *jus non appellandi*. The result was that the Empire and Germany had ceased to be, and in their place were three hundred and forty-three independent States. Puffendorf was right in saying that the Empire was neither a monarchy nor an aristocracy. 'It is not even a federated State, but a Federation of States, a disorderly agglomeration, a monster unique of its kind.'

(b) *The Results in Europe* France and Sweden, the two powers which had emerged triumphant from the Thirty Years War, were fully determined to secure 'satisfaction' for the costs of the war and to take advantage of the opportunity to achieve their territorial ambitions. France especially had come to the end of her financial resources. She had subsidized all the allied powers. Mazarin wrote to Servien, one of his delegates at

Munster 'All credit has dried up there is no more money left to tap and every purse is shut' (14th August 1648). Sweden, on the other hand, had suffered a fearful loss in men, about half of the effective population. The country was exhausted.

The 'satisfaction' of France was settled in Clause 69 et seq. of the Treaty of Munster. The Empire and the Emperor ceded to France (i) the sovereignty of jurisdiction exercised by the Empire over the three Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun and their dependent territories, (ii) Old-Breisach, with its suburbs and adjacent districts, (iii) the right to keep a garrison in Philippsburg, (iv) the landgravate of Upper and Lower Alsace, with the Sundgau and the prefectorate of the ten free imperial towns in Alsace. The plenipotentiaries had doubtless, as deliberately on one side as the other, left ambiguities in these clauses, which later enabled Louis XIV to create the *Chambers of Reunion*. The minister Pomponne also later observed 'Certain articles in the Treaty of Westphalia have not always been explained with sufficient accuracy, no doubt intentionally to allow one party to get the better of the other as circumstances permitted owing to the ambiguities which each allowed to be inserted.'

The 'Satisfaction' of Sweden was settled by Article X of the Treaty of Osnabrück. The Empire ceded 'all hither Pomerania and the island of Rugen . . . further Pomerania besides and the towns of Stettin and Gollnow with the river Oder and the arm of the sea commonly called Frisches Haff, the town and the port of Wismar with the right to fortify them, the archbishopric of Bremen and the bishopric of Verden'.

Her Most Serene Majesty (Queen Christina of Sweden) and her successors—by a privilege denied to the king of France in Alsace—were to be invited in the future to diets of the Empire by the title of dukes of Bremen, Verden, and Pomerania, and by the title of princes of Rugen and lords of Wismar. They were to be given a seat 'in the College of Princes on the secular bench, No. 5 in the row'. Sweden would thenceforward have four votes in the diet, two for the Pomeranias and one each for Bremen and Verden.

One of the most important clauses in the treaty was that which entrusted the contracting parties with the control and guarantee of the execution of the treaty Article XVII of Osnabrück, clauses 111 and 112 of Munster

The contracting parties to this Treaty are all and each of them is severally bound to defend and maintain all and every one of the articles of this peace against any person whosoever it be without distinction of creed. And should any article happen to be violated, the injured party shall use his best endeavours to divert the aggressor from his course either by submitting the matter to an amicable compromise or by process of law . Nevertheless if the issue shall not have been settled by either of these means within the space of three years, all and each of the contracting parties shall be bound to give their counsel and unite their forces to those of the injured party and to take up arms to repel the aggression, when the injured party shall have proved to their satisfaction that he has failed to succeed either by amicable arrangement or by process of law

These treaties which suppressed bishoprics, distributed ecclesiastical property, made secularizations irrevocable, and acknowledged the legal existence of Lutheranism and Calvinism, also perpetuated the breach of the religious unity of the West. It will therefore be understood why the Papal legate withdrew before they came to be signed and why Pope Innocent X solemnly protested in the Bull *Zelo Domus Dei* (20th November 1648) against the Peace of Westphalia, declaring it to be 'null and void, accursed and without any influence or result for the past or the present or the future', and adding that no one, even if he had promised on oath to observe the peace, was bound in conscience to keep his oath, inasmuch as an oath to execute an unjust or evil purpose could not bind in conscience.

SOURCES

Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges in den Zeiten des vorwaltenden Einflusses der Wittelsbacher (Histor Kommission der K. Bayr Akademie), Leipzig, 1908-18 Loserth, *Akten und Korrespondenzen zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich unter Ferdinand II*, Vienna, 1906-7 Losche, *Monumenta Austriae Evangelica*, Tübingen, 1908 C Caraffa, *Commentaria de Germania sacra restaurata*, Cologne, 1639 (continued to 1641), Frankfort, 1641 F Forster, *Albrecht von Wallensteins ungedruckte, eigenhandige, vertrauliche Briefe u amliche Schreiben, &c*, vol 1, 1627-34, vol 11, 1629-33 (with an Appendix on corrupted sources and the death of Gustavus

Adolphus), vol III, 1633-4 (negotiations, legal proceedings, and sketch of the life of Arnim), Berlin, 1828-9 *Wallensteins Correspondenz, eine Nachlese*, von B. Dudik, Vienna, 1865 The same authority's *Correspondenz Kaiser Ferdinands II u s erl Familie mit P. Martin Becanus und P. Wilhelm Lamormaini, S.J.*, Archiv für Österreich Gesch., LIV, Vienna, 1876 Freidensburg, *Regesten zur deutschen Geschichte aus der Zeit des Pontifikats Innocenz X.*, 1901-4 et seq *Instrumentum Pacis Westphalicae*, Text of the Pacifications of Osnabrück and Munster with the Imperial Edict as to execution, ed Berringer, Munster, 1648 *Acta Pacis Westphalicae publica oder Westphal Freudenhandlungen u. Geschichte*, ed J. G. von Meiern, 6 vols, Hanover and Goettingen, 1734-6 et seq, and three supplementary volumes, Goettingen, 1747 *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken*, 4 vols (1628-35), ed H. Kiewning, Berlin, 1895-7 The *Mémoires* of Richelieu, 1610-38, his correspondence, diplomatic instructions, and State papers and numerous memoirs by important French personages of the time

CHAPTER V

THE RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN EUROPE ABOUT THE YEAR 1648

Summary 1 General observations on the religious development of Europe from 1517 to 1648 2 The Catholic States—Spain, France, Austria, Bohemia, Hungary, Italy 3 The Protestant States—Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, Holland, England

I GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE FROM THE RELIGIOUS POINT OF VIEW BETWEEN 1517 AND 1648

THE chief sufferer by the Peace of Westphalia was the Christian religion in general. Christianity had endeavoured to impose the rules of its divinely revealed morality not on individuals and families only, but on States as well. The profound significance of the great struggle known to history as the Quarrel of Investitures and the disputes between the Church and the State was that they were an attempt to determine whether politics should be subordinated to morality—in terms of the Middle Ages, whether the policy of kings should be controlled by the moral principles of which the Pope was guardian and interpreter—or whether, on the contrary, politics were an art independent of any absolute rule of divine or human origin and the interests of his particular state the sole consideration to which the Statesman should pay attention. Early in the sixteenth century Niccolò Machiavelli had laid down as a principle the subordination of religion to politics and worked out the implications which necessarily followed from his radical denial of the existence of international morality. He had, in truth, invented nothing new. He was merely theorizing upon what was already the practice of his time. The great European conflicts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, already complicated by colonial problems which were to assume an importance that increased with time, had made *diplomacy* a factor of increasing magnitude. Modern diplomacy was the creation of the small Italian States, in the first place of the Holy See and after it of the republics of Venice and Florence. At

first it was the custom for states to send to one another special ambassadors for special and important missions later they became a permanent establishment and diplomacy presently became a normal institution in Europe. It was in its hey-day under Richelieu and Mazarin in France. It had contributed to the formation of a peculiar state of mind in the men entrusted with the direction of the policy of the various peoples of Europe. They had grown accustomed to consider religion as only one among many political factors and to further the interests that it was their duty to promote according to purely political standards.

If the Holy See, which Luther and Calvin regarded as the seat of Antichrist, could have been destroyed about that time, the triumph of the State would probably have been complete. Religion would have sunk to the level of a mere department of government like agriculture or the navy.

In the Protestant States, the princes were left absolutely free for the future to control ecclesiastical affairs at their pleasure, except in countries where, for political reasons, opposition arose against absolutism and made use of religion as a weapon in the struggle against monarchy, as was the case of the Puritan opposition in England under the Stuarts. Even in Catholic countries the political influence even of a religion which possessed an international organization was considerably diminished. The jurists devoted their energies to developing theories of the omnipotence of the State and sought to curtail the influence of the Holy See by theories such as Gallicanism, and, later, Josephism. The struggle between Jansenism and Rome was of great assistance to the jurists in their ambition to make the State supreme.

Once the religious unity which had been the chief characteristic of the Middle Ages was shattered, each State pursued its separate course of development according to its geographical and economic situation. The tactlessness of James I, the folly of Charles I, the dogged tenacity of the English gentry, the lack of a predominant armed force under the control of the king's government resulted, after a prolonged and dramatic civil war,

in the defeat and execution of the king, and what was more important, in the substitution for monarchical government first of military despotism and afterwards of the government of a ruling or privileged class which henceforward claimed for itself irresponsible authority over the country. Similar causes were followed by similar results in Holland the Stadholderate was suppressed in 1650 and an attempt made to establish a republic In France, on the other hand, the disorders of the Fronde, which clearly reflected on more than one occasion the influence of events in England, made the necessity of order and concentration everywhere so deeply felt that the monarchy emerged consolidated for more than a century. Such political changes, however, in no way affected the religious situation. Parliaments and kings vied with one another in intolerance once they felt that they had ceased to be bound by restrictions of treaties or public agreements The various States of Europe, one by one, may usefully be considered from this point of view, the Catholic first and after them the Protestant

2 THE CATHOLIC STATES

The principal Catholic States in the first half of the seventeenth century were Spain, France, Austria, and its dependencies, Hungary and Bohemia, the little Italian States, a certain number of German States, of which Bavaria was the most important, and Poland

(a) *Spain.* She had lost Portugal for the second time in 1640, after its reconquest by Philip II in 1580. She had engaged in a long series of costly wars. She had believed that the possession and exploitation of vast colonies would enable her to play a part of the highest importance in the politics of Europe Ambitious at one and the same time to be the leader of the Catholic cause in Europe, its defender against the Moslem, its propagator in the New World, she had saddled herself with a task gigantic beyond the capacity of Man. Unscrupulous enemies were ever ready to take advantage of her difficulties, and, as a result, her preoccupations in America had by the middle of the seventeenth century so absorbed her energies that she was no longer capable

of playing the predominant part in Europe which she had played a hundred years before under Philip II. She was, nevertheless, the most considerable State in Europe, because her empire included in addition to the greater part of the Iberian peninsula, Flanders, Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, the Milanese, Franche-Comté, some outposts in Morocco, and a vast colonial empire including the Philippines in Asia, and an enormous territory in America which may be calculated at, say, twenty-eight times the area of the Spanish peninsula.

She had refused to tolerate religious dissenters. The Catholic religion was the only form of worship allowed. The Government and public opinion were agreed in their refusal to tolerate any religious divisions. The Inquisitional Tribunal of the Holy Office, as dangerous a menace to the clergy as to the faithful, had, in spite of the repeated protests of the Holy See, degenerated into a mere instrument in the hands of the royal executive. It was at this date only too often used, and was to continue to be used until its abolition in 1820, to serve largely political ends. The Catholic Faith was still exuberant with life among the populace: vocations to the secular and regular priesthood were numerous. The Society of Jesus provided the most erudite theologians. Theological studies flourished in the Universities. The name of de Lugo († 1660) was, after Suarez, one of the most celebrated. The Carmelite Order had been reformed by St Theresa and spread outside Spain all over Europe and into the American colonies. The Third Orders of St Francis and St Dominic expanded and increased amongst the faithful. The New World produced its first flower of heroic sanctity in Rose of Lima (1586–1617), and great numbers of heroic and devoted missionaries.

Portugal, which had just recovered her political independence under an illegitimate member of the house of Braganza, lost a great part of her colonies in the course of the war between Spain and Holland. But she retained sufficient to continue down to our day a colonial power of some importance.

(b) *France* which, under Louis XIV, was to attain the zenith of her power in Europe not only in arms and politics but also

in literature and the fine arts, by the influence of her manners and habits of living, her elegance of conversation and style in dress, was still not so extensive territorially as at the present day. She did not yet include Corsica, which belonged to Genoa, or the county of Nice or Savoy or Franche-Comté or Lorraine or the county of Venaissin or Flanders.

Richelieu had strongly centralized it. He had crushed the power of Protestantism and the turbulence of the nobility at home. The king had become absolute master. After the violent but short-lived crisis of the Fronde, the omnipotence of the monarchy was to become as plainly apparent in the practice as in the theories of jurists and theologians such as Bossuet. As far as religion was concerned, the Edict of Nantes was still in force. The Protestant form of worship, the *R P R* (*la religion prétendue réformée*, 'the so-called reformed religion') as it was officially styled, continued to be tolerated officially but had lost all political influence and, faced with an intense Catholic revival, daily lost many of its adherents.

The Wars of Religion delayed for thirty or forty years the advent in France of the Catholic Reform which had done its work all over Europe, but the harvest as a result was only the more abundant. The religious revival became manifest in the beginning of the seventeenth century. The Council of Trent, which had been repudiated by Parlement and king, was adopted by the clergy. The bishops had published on the 7th July 1615, of their own initiative, the decrees of the great Council. The fame of the great saints who had edified Italy and Spain began to penetrate into the country and evoked the noblest rivalries. Then St Francis of Sales appeared upon the scene—a Savoyard by birth but French in language and influence.

Francis was born in 1567 at Thorens in Savoy and had studied in Paris, where a violent religious crisis had resolved itself in his soul in an impassioned outburst of fervent devotion. He became a priest and offered his services to his bishop, Claude de Granier, for the evangelization of the Chablais, which at the time was overrun by Calvinists. This was in 1594. The young apostle preached at first for eight months without

success, at the cost of fatigues innumerable and deadly dangers. The hearts of the people opened at last almost miraculously before his persuasive influence and the country was almost entirely converted to Catholicism. The zeal of a single man had accomplished the prodigious feat in three years. A little later Francis became bishop of Geneva, with Annecy for his seat. But France attracted him. In 1602 he came to Paris and received a warm welcome from society—the Guises, the Nemours, the Mercœurs. Henry IV himself showered favours upon him. The saint, who was also an acute and penetrating psychologist, observed the society about him with curious eyes, a society full of faith but of frivolous morals, which considered piety and devotion to be incompatible with the pleasures of life in the world. It was in order to destroy this prejudice that he wrote, nominally for a lady, Mme de Charmoisy, whose spiritual director he was, but in reality for the public, the admirable book entitled *An Introduction to the Devout Life*, a masterpiece of logic, good sense, and devout Christian piety no less than of acute psychological insight and literary elegance. The *Introduction* is a text-book for the instruction of the faithful living in the world in the means of attaining true sanctity. The Catholic Reform had henceforth established itself on the soil of France. Henry IV recalled in 1603 the Jesuits who had been expelled in 1595. One of their number, the famous Père Cotton, who was born in Néronde-en-Forez, even became Confessor to the king. In 1610 the Society counted 36 schools or colleges, 5 novitiates, a scholasticate, a mission, and 1,400 members. The number rose about the middle of the century to 84 colleges, 64 other houses, and 4,000 members. They inspired fresh life into the studies and reformed the minds of the upper classes in French society, and their influence on the expansion of literature in what was later to be known as the *Grand Siècle* can scarcely be exaggerated. The College of La Flèche alone numbered 1,200 pupils when Descartes left it in 1612.

While the Jesuits took for their province the education of young men, the Ursulines, who opened their first house in France in 1608, devoted themselves to the instruction of girls.

They became an enclosed Order in 1612 and, spreading with astonishing rapidity, furnished a model for the Christian education of young women which other congregations adopted.

Before their arrival, however, Jeanne de Lestonnac, a niece of Montaigne, had instituted in Bordeaux the Order of the Daughters of Our Lady (*les Filles de Notre Dame*) for the education of girls, especially such as belonged to Protestant families. It was confirmed in 1607 by Pope Paul V. St Peter Fourier (1565–1640) and Alix Le Clerc (†1622) also founded the Canonesses of Our Lady (*les Chanoinesses de Notre-Dame*), and they, too, spread rapidly. Side by side with the teaching Orders which were to provide France with families solidly established on sound Christian principles and to reform the governing class of the nation, centres of fervent mystic piety, an essential element to the full expansion of Catholic devotion, became more and more numerous. Madame Acarie, whose director was the famous abbé, later cardinal, de Bérulle, introduced the Carmelites into France, established the first French Carmel in 1603, entered herself, as soon as she became a widow, with three of her daughters, and bore the name of Sister Mary of the Incarnation, by which she was beatified in 1791.

Another admirable Frenchwoman, St. Jeanne de Chantal, whose director was St. Francis of Sales, founded in 1610 the Order of the Visitation. It had been the intention of the bishop of Geneva to promote a society of devout widows whose objects should be the visitation of the sick and the performance of other works of charity—hence the name of the Order. But the advice of Mgr. de Marquemont, archbishop of Lyons, prevailed and the project was abandoned, the Visitation became an enclosed Order. When its energetic founder died at Moulins on the 13th December 1641, she had the satisfaction of being able to count eighty-seven convents under her Rule in France and Savoy.

It is not to be thought that all this was achieved without difficulty. It is rather, on the contrary, a sign of the times that St. Francis of Sales, for all his zeal and energy, was unable in an episcopate of twenty years' duration to establish a single seminary in his diocese.

A constellation of devout persons, nevertheless, devoted their energies at the time to the reform of the secular clergy in France

The clergy in France were then divided, as everywhere else, into two classes the higher clergy consisting of bishops, mitred abbots, vicars-general, and prebendary canons, and the lesser clergy, parish priests, and their curates. The higher clergy were recruited from the nobility and were not always entirely admirable characters. Of one hundred and twenty-seven bishops at the beginning of the reign of Louis XIII, ten might be cited whose conduct was far from edifying. Other prelates were entirely absorbed in politics and solely concerned with high matters of State. The lower clergy, on the other hand, were as a rule utterly uneducated and undisciplined. There were priests who refused to wear clerical dress and lived in an entirely worldly fashion.

The clergy, however, such as it was after the fearful disturbance of forty years of civil war, could boast some eminent men. King Henry IV was eager to secure good bishops. He would gladly have styled St. Francis of Sales in France. In default of St. Francis, he selected two of his own friends for the episcopate, Camus for Belley and Fenoillet for Montpellier. Lorraine had a model parish priest—the Curé d'Ars of his time—in Pierre Fourier, who had charge of the parish of Maitaincourt. His goodness, charity, and devotion were beyond praise. He would have had the parish priest be ‘the shepherd of his flock, their father, mother, captain, guide, guard, sentinel, doctor, advocate, agent, nurse, pattern and mirror, all things to all’.

The chief agents, however, of the French reform were Cardinal de Bérulle, who founded the Oratory on the 11th November 1611, on the model of St. Philip Neri, to serve as a centre for the education of priests; St. Vincent de Paul, whose proverbial charity was destined to inscribe one of the fairest pages in the history of Christian devotion to the poor; M. Olier, the founder of the Company of St Sulpice; St. Eudes, who organized the congregation of Jesus and Mary (the Eudist

Fathers); and Adrian Bourdoise, the parish priest of St Nicholas du Chardonnet in Paris

Cardinal de Bérulle at the Oratory, with the help of the learned and devout Père de Condren, restored the sublime idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice which had been attacked with such vehemence by the Protestants and thence drew the principle which inspired the regeneration of the clergy. The whole ideal of sanctity, as far as the priest is concerned, is contained in the bishop's admonition to his ordinands *Imitate what you are called upon to administer* The exalted nature of the office necessitates a corresponding elevation of soul By unceasing application of this maxim the Oratorians educated devout priests who inaugurated the Catholic revival throughout the dioceses

St Vincent de Paul¹ was not only a hero of charity. He was also, and still more, in the words of Abelly, his earliest biographer, 'servently devoted to the priesthood of Jesus Christ'. M. Vincent was the son of a peasant and willingly recalled his origin He was born in the parish of Pouy, near Dax, in the Landes district in the extreme south-west of France, and educated first by the Grey Friars of St. Francis at Dax and afterwards at the universities of Saragossa and Toulouse. He was ordained priest and, falling into the hands of the corsairs of Tunis, became familiar with the horrors of captivity in a Mohammedan country. But he succeeded in converting his master, an apostate Christian from Nice, and fled with him first to Aigues-Mortes and then on to Avignon There the Papal vice-legate, Cardinal Pietro Montorio, took a liking to Vincent and brought him to Rome. He was chosen to carry a dispatch to Henry IV, and left Rome in 1609 for France on a secret mission to the king What it was he never revealed He soon came into touch with de Bérulle and began to breathe the air of the Oratory His zeal, which was already great, although still tainted, perhaps, with certain mundane ambitions, gradually became absolutely supernatural and exemplary He

¹ Cf. Henri Lavedan's *Monsieur Vincent, Aumonier des Galères*, which has been translated by Fr Leonard, C.M., under the title of *The heroic Life of St Vincent de Paul*, London, 1929 Antoine Redier's *Vraie vie de St Vincent*, an admirable essay in hagiography, has not yet been published in English

accepted a small charge at Clichy, where his church still stands in the main street of that 'red' industrial suburb of Paris—it was then (1612) a country village—and there became a pattern of the virtues of a parish priest. We next meet him as tutor and chaplain to the de Gondi family. His self-sacrificing devotion in that capacity to the poor convicts in the galleys, which were under the command of M. de Gondi, General of the galleys of France, was such that it has given birth to a legend.¹ But Vincent's absorbing interest was the evangelization of the countryside to which Mme de Gondi had besought him to devote his energies. For the rest of his life he kept the anniversary of the 25th January 1617, the day on which he had preached for the first time to the peasants of Châtillon-des-Dombes, a village in the province of La Bresse, then in the diocese of Lyons, but now under the bishop of Belley. The idea then occurred to him of associating ladies in easy circumstances in a Confraternity of Ladies of Charity (1617), with the object of visiting the poor in their own homes and there succouring them. He returned in the meantime to the Gondi family and devoted his energies to putting into practice the experience he had just acquired. In 1624 he organized the Priests of the Mission, a congregation which received the Pope's approval in 1632. In 1628 he inaugurated at Beauvais a system of retreats for candidates for the priesthood intended to prepare future priests to receive Holy Orders by a course of ten days' meditation and spiritual exercises. Jean-François de Gondi, the first archbishop of Paris (Paris hitherto had only been a bishopric), made these retreats compulsory in his diocese. Pope Alexander VII (Chigi) followed the archbishop's example, as far as Rome was concerned, in 1659. The practice has since become a formal rule of Canon Law. In 1633 Vincent de Paul organized at St. Lazare, an immense building then occupied by the very relaxed community of the Augustinian Canons Regular, and the temporary head-quarters of the Congregation

¹ That is to say, the famous story of Vincent's having taken for a while a convict's place has been denied. We have no particulars, only a tradition not in itself incredible.

of the Mission, the famous 'Tuesday Conferences' at which the élite of the Paris clergy gathered to discuss the needs of the Church and the virtues necessary to the vocation of the priesthood. Bossuet, who took part in them from 1654 to 1660, testified to their value in the most glowing terms in the process for the beatification of Vincent in 1702.

The Sisters of Charity were founded in that same year 1633 under his direction and the control of the refined and devoted Louise de Marillac, who had married M Le Gras, secretary to Marie de' Medici, at the age of twenty-two. She was beatified in 1921. They were good, pious peasant girls recruited at first to help the Ladies of Charity in heavy tasks and subsequently organized in a separate society. The work they accomplished was truly astonishing, a most palpable manifestation of the character of Catholic piety founded upon the 'faith that worketh by charity' (Galatians v 6), that is to say, the principle which Luther rejected of the supernatural value of good works performed in the faith and love of Christ. There are at the present day nearly 3,000 houses, of which 1,000 are in France, with 35,000 sisters tending the sick, old people, and orphans with indefatigable self-sacrifice. St Vincent de Paul died in Paris on the 27th September 1660, at the age of eighty-four, heavily laden with merit and followed to the grave by the blessings of the suffering multitude who had so magnificently benefited by his boundless charity.

Meanwhile the impulse given by the Oratory to the establishment of associations for the education of the clergy issued in various directions in the foundation of seminaries in conformity with the decrees of the Council of Trent. Adrien Bourdoise (1584-1665), a parish priest of finely tempered character, an individual and occasionally abrupt habit of mind but candid and racy of speech, organized in his parish of St. Nicholas-du-Chardonnet in Paris a sort of school for priests which between 1637 and 1642 educated 118 poor clerks and prepared them for ordination. Better still, Jean-Jacques Olier (1608-1657), who had been ordained priest in 1633 and was a zealous missionary in Auvergne, came to take up residence in Paris as vicar of

St Sulpice: he opened a seminary there in 1642 for the clerks of his parish and developing his pious ambitions established between 1645 and 1651 in the Rue du Vieux Colombier, the Great Seminary of St Sulpice to receive clerks from the various dioceses of France. His foundation soon became prosperous and branched off into Canada, where it played a marvellous part in the colonization of the country. St John Eudes, another ardent missionary who had at first joined the Oratory but quitted that Society in 1643, established in Caen the Congregation of Jesus and Mary which presently opened a seminary at Coutances for the training of zealous popular preachers to preach missions in country districts.

The enormous results achieved early in the seventeenth century in France by the Catholic Reform may be estimated by such facts and such names. Rarely has any religious revival been so brilliant. Devoted workers collaborated in all parts of the country. It was then that 'Catholic Brittany' was evangelized by Michel Le Nobletz, the Jesuit Maunoir and his three hundred assistants, and received the stamp of Christian faith which it has retained down to the present day. Then also the mountains of the Cevennes, which in the preceding century had been a stronghold of Calvinism, were largely won back by the preaching and virtuous example of such missionaries as St Francis Régis, who was born near Narbonne and died at La Louvesc in 1640 at the age of forty-three from exhaustion induced by his apostolic labours 'carrying with him to the grave the burden and the secret of the 10,000 confessions he had heard in the last four months of his life' (Goyau). Then also a blind Oratorian, the famous Père Lejeune (1592-1672), a native of Poligny, traversed town and country preaching with an overflowing torrential vehemence which was irresistible, a prelude to the great stream of oratory which was to burst forth towards the end of the century. Then, finally, the duke de Ventadour assembled in March 1630 in the Capuchin convent of the Faubourg St. Honoré, the élite of the laity, and in association with them founded the Company of the Blessed Sacrament, which professed to blend harmoniously

the precepts of faith and the habits and customs of private and social life

Such activities explain the great era of Catholic expansion in the France of Bossuet, Fénelon, Bourdaloue, Fléchier, and Massillon.

(c) *Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary* The Treaties of Westphalia had not affected Austria, which had never known any other State religion than the Catholic. Other forms of religion were legally tolerated, but within narrow limits, and lived a precarious existence. Bohemia was not affected either. There Catholicism had been restored by the energy of Ferdinand II on the morrow of the victory of the White Hill in 1620. The Catholic prelates had recovered their rights everywhere. The Jesuits had returned and had established colleges in every town (five in Prague alone) and schools in the most important villages. The religious Orders, old and new, vied with the Jesuits in Catholic zeal. The Protestant preachers were at the same time expelled; the Calvinists in 1621, the Lutherans in 1622. The 'Reform' decree of the 31st July 1627 gave dissenters the option between returning to the Catholic Church and going into exile within six months. The serfs were to be instructed simply as a matter of course in the Catholic religion. The archbishop of Prague was even compelled to protest against certain too summary proceedings of the government. One hundred and eighty-five noble and thirty-six thousand middle-class families left the country. The population had been devastated by war and fell from 2,500,000 to about 800,000. A century elapsed before the country recovered its former prosperity.

Hungary was divided into three parts: Turkish Hungary in the centre, Transylvania and Austrian Hungary in the west. Force of circumstances—the proximity of the frontier and the Turks no less than the influence of the Transylvanian princes—restrained the Emperors from applying such summary methods as in Bohemia. The Catholic restoration in Hungary was the work of a few eminent personages such as Cardinal Peter Pazmany, archbishop of Gran, and Count Nicholas Esterhazy,

(† 1665). It was widely successful, and as a result of it Hungary has remained a substantially Catholic country to this day. The cardinal was the son of Calvinist parents, was converted at the age of thirteen and joined the Society of Jesus four years later. A zealous missionary, professor, apologist, and controversialist, he was appointed archbishop of Gran in 1616 and died at Pressburg in 1637. The Protestants, however, still retained important offices, thanks to the support of the nobility and Prince Rakoczy of Transylvania.

(d) *Italy* About half of the territory of Italy belonged at the time to Spain, the jealous custodian of Catholic orthodoxy. The other half of the country was divided into States of varying size, of which the most important were the States of the Church, including Latium, Umbria, the March of Ancona, Romagna, the principality of Benevento and Pontecorvo, not to mention Avignon and the county of Venaissin in France—the duchy of Savoy—and the republic of Venice. The republic was making a desperate struggle to maintain its trade in the East against the encroachments of the Turks across the seas and among the islands. The republic of Genoa was a tributary of Spain. The duchies of Parma, Piacenza, Modena, Reggio, and Mantua were but tiny States. The grand duchy of Tuscany was governed by the Medici, and suffered from an administration which was both arbitrary and indolent.

From the religious point of view Protestantism found itself wellnigh annihilated everywhere, both by the pressure of public opinion, which since the end of the Council of Trent had once more become unanimously Catholic, and the severity of the laws enacted against it. For a brief period at the time of their first preaching Protestant doctrines had gained a certain amount of acceptance among Italians, but the Italian mind, when it rejects Catholicism, runs rather to scepticism and to what was to be described towards the end of the seventeenth century as ‘free-thought’ than to alternative versions of Christianity. By this time the vigour of the Catholic Reform, however, and the coercive measures taken against dissenters maintained or re-established Catholic unity throughout the peninsula, though

there were plenty of signs, at this as at every period, of the persistence of scepticism.

(e) *Poland* On the extinction of the Jagellon dynasty, Poland had become an elective kingdom Thenceforward it contained the seeds of decay It had already, under the weak and incapable Sigismund II, become the chosen land of every malcontent, the home of every variety of religion in Europe The mass of the population continued Catholic, but the nobles inclined, as their individual preferences dictated, to Lutheranism, Calvinism, or Socinianism The Lithuanian prince Michael Radzivil (Black Radzivil) published the first Calvinist version of the Bible in Polish, but his sons reverted to Catholicism The advent of the Bohemian Brethren (Moravians) increased the number of sects dividing the country, but the kings never broke formally with Rome. The Catholic cause was energetically championed by the Papal legates, Lippomano, Commendone, bishop of Zante, and Cardinal Hosius. The Jesuits, introduced into Poland by Peter Canisius, performed their usual work of Catholic evangelization and education. Thanks to their activity and the influence of their establishments in the dioceses of Posen, Ermeland (Warmia), and Wilna, Poland gradually became once more a fundamentally Catholic country in which devotion to the ancestral religion was synonymous with patriotism.

3 THE PROTESTANT STATES

Over against the Catholic States stood the Protestant States They were Lutheran or Calvinist and not always in friendly relations with one another, even from the religious point of view.

(a) *Sweden*, which had gone over to the Lutheran reformation under the anti-Catholic régime of Gustavus Vasa, who, in 1527, had declared all Church property to be the property of the Crown, nearly became Catholic again under King John III, the son and second successor of Gustavus (1568-92). John had married a Polish Catholic princess and, himself a Catholic at heart, designed to bring his people back to Catholicism without

anybody noticing it A Jesuit, Fr Nielssen, had been appointed professor of Lutheran theology in Stockholm, and another Jesuit, Fr Antonio Possevino, had been received as Papal legate in the country Nielssen's disguise, however, was finally pierced and a strong current of Lutheran reaction set in against foreign professors. Nielssen and Possevino were compelled to leave Sweden in 1580, after toiling for more than four years in the Catholic cause in the country Before he left, Possevino had the satisfaction of receiving King John into the Catholic Church King John had also imposed on every church a form of liturgy, which was almost Catholic, called 'The Red Book' But after his death, more especially after the victory of Charles IX against his nephew Sigismund, the son of John III and like him a Catholic, triumphant Lutheranism took a signal revenge Sigismund was declared deposed, his partisans were prosecuted and put to death The practice of the Catholic religion even in private was forbidden under pain of death, and Mass was abolished throughout the kingdom except only in Embassy chapels

Sweden at the time included Finland and the Baltic provinces. The Peace of Westphalia, as has been seen, increased its territory by the addition of Pomcrania, Stettin, Wismar, Rugen, Bremen, and Verden Queen Christina, who succeeded her father, Gustavus Adolphus, became a convert to Catholicism and abdicated in 1654, preferring, said Voltaire, the conversation of men of learning to ruling over a nation familiar with nothing but the practice of arms; preferring, we may also add, to live in a land where she would be allowed the free practice of her religion. It was not until the accession of Gustavus III that some slight toleration was extended to Catholics on the 24th January 1781, but penal laws were in force up to the middle of the nineteenth century.

(b) *Denmark.* Whereas Sweden had preserved the titles of archbishop and bishop, Denmark had suppressed them as early as 1536. King Christian III had had the bishops arrested, and on the same day their sees were abolished by a mock Parliament and their property confiscated for the benefit of the Crown

Bugenhagen, the friend of Luther, appointed superintendents, as in Saxony, to take their places Catholicism was thenceforth prohibited throughout the kingdom—which then comprised Norway—and the Danish law of Christian V enacted in 1683 that only the Lutheran religion was lawful in the country and that ‘monks, Jesuits and Papist ecclesiastical persons of that sort’ were formally excluded

(c) *Germany* The religious map of Germany at the time is difficult to draw Lutheranism was generally predominant in the States of the north, while Catholicism retained Bavaria, the ecclesiastical electorates, and such of the bishoprics as had not been secularized Wurtemburg, Brandenburg, Saxony, and the imperial towns had gone over to Lutheranism. Calvinism, on the other hand, had Anhalt, the Palatinate, Bremen, and Hesse-Cassel Fierce disputes had broken out in the Lutheran camp immediately after the death of the Reformer Melanchthon had been accused of crypto-Calvinism for having attempted to explain the doctrine of the Real Presence otherwise than in accordance with Luther’s theory the omnipresence of the Body of Christ in virtue of ‘the communication of idioms’, that is to say, of the peculiar properties of Divinity in the human nature in Jesus Christ The ‘old Lutherans’, led by the turbulent and uncompromising Matthaeus Flacius, called from his place of birth Illyricus, had sided violently against the Melanchthonians or ‘Philippists’, and the dispute became still further complicated by differences of opinion respecting the nature of justification and original sin The ‘Philippists’ insisted upon the concurrence of human freedom, redeemed by the Holy Ghost The Flacian party, on the other hand, maintained that original sin is our very substance and that justification in our case was impossible if we were not entirely passive Each side maintained that its own theory was the more ‘consolatory’ The Philippists had succeeded in converting the universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig to their views, but ‘old Lutheranism’ had vigorously resisted such contaminations of the pure milk of the Lutheran gospel by ‘sacramental’ or Calvinist influences Although the Philippists succeeded in maintaining themselves in some centres

such as Nuremberg, they lost ground nearly everywhere else. The famous *Formulae Concordiae* of 1577 and 1580 registered their final defeat in Saxony and Brandenburg. All these quarrels were exasperated by mutual persecutions, every victory of one side over the other being followed by harsh repressive measures against the defeated party.

It had proved impossible to preserve intact the pure Biblicism of the early days. Other books of faith were added to the Bible, and their number increased as time went on. The Brandenburg-Nuremberg group, for example, adopted in 1573, after protracted and complicated diplomatic negotiations, twelve confessional books in addition to the Bible, namely, (1) the three ancient Creeds, (2) the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, (3) the Confession of Augsburg, (4) the Apology for that Confession, (5) the Articles of Schmalkalden, (6) the repetition of the confession of Augsburg presented to the Council of Trent, (7) the *Loci Communes* of Melanchthon, (8) the Examination of Ordinands by the same, (9) the *Definitiones Appellationum* by the same, (10) the *Responsiones ad impios Bavarios Articulos* by the same, (11) the *Responsio de Controversia Stancari* by the same (12) the Ecclesiastical Ordinances for the province of Brandenburg, a sort of civil constitution binding on the Protestant clergy of the province.

The innumerable discussions which arose between Lutheran theologians had made it abundantly clear that 'error could not possibly be avoided, even though Scripture were to be taken as the sole rule of faith'.¹ Such being the case, the Lutheran Churches may be said to have been founded upon the principle of authority just as much as the ancient Catholic Church of which they were the living critics, with this difference, that the authority under whose yoke they bowed was a purely secular authority, the authority of a State that could not be competent in the matter, not the authority of a Church whose teaching had been uniform from the beginning.

¹ Cf. on this point, which is cited here merely as an example, Karl Schornbaum's article, 'Die brandenburgisch-nurnbergische Norma doctrinae', in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 1923.

One result of the Thirty Years War was to make this servitude of the Churches still more rigorous and absolute. Another was a dreadful state of misery in countries which had been ravaged and laid waste by armies of every complexion, Protestant as well as Catholic. Large tracts of Germany were converted into desolate regions, while the country people in certain districts relapsed into barbarism through intense material distress.

(d) *Switzerland* The Catholic restoration which followed the Council of Trent was personified in Switzerland in St Charles Borromeo in the south, in St Peter Canisius in the west, and in Christopher Blarer, bishop of Bâle, in the north-west. The legation of the Holy See in Lucerne had become the centre of resistance for the ancient faith. From Zurich, which still faithfully adhered to the memory of Zwingli, and Geneva, where the stern tradition of Calvin still predominated, bitter attacks were launched against Catholicism, which had resumed a victorious offensive. Geneva again kept a jealous eye upon the Calvinist churches which had been established in neighbouring countries, notably in France and in the Netherlands. The history of Arminianism offers an interesting example of its vigilance. Jacob Hermans, better known under the latinized form of his name as Arminius, was born in 1560 at Oudewater in Holland. He was one of the pupils whom Calvin's successor, Theodore of Béza, had educated at the Academy of Geneva, the Staff College as it were of Calvinism, whence preachers were dispatched at intervals to all the surrounding countries. He was a well-known preacher at Amsterdam when Prince Maurice of Nassau had him appointed professor of theology at Leyden (1603). Arminius had been entrusted with the duty of combating the opponents of the Calvinist dogma of predestination. The God of Calvin appeared too harsh and austere to the minds of many. They would fain have believed that predestination to Hell was determined only after the original Fall, that God's election of His saints was consequent to his prescience of the Fall and contemplated man as already fallen, and they were, therefore, described as *Infralapsarians*. Arminius made a careful study of their tenets and, becoming converted

to their ideas, became also their leader. His staunch opponent was the orthodox Calvinist, Franciscus Gomarus, another professor in Leyden. A violent controversy broke out between *infralapsarians* and *supralapsarians*, and Arminians and Gomarists fruitlessly confronted each other in noisy disputations at The Hague in 1608 and 1609. Arminius died on the 19th October 1609, without having lived to see the end of the debate, but his party survived. The question at issue was no less than the conception of the Godhead. The youthful pensionary of Rotterdam, the celebrated Hugo de Groot (Grotius), was the most illustrious of the champions who were bold enough to attempt to mitigate the ferocity of Calvin's doctrine. But Geneva was keeping watch from afar. From Geneva came John Diodati and Theodore Tronchin, her most illustrious theologians, to the Synod of Dordrecht, which had been convoked in 1618 to settle the controversy, and they came to testify to the God of Calvin. The Arminians, however, at a convention held at Gouda, had formulated their doctrine in five articles addressed to the States-General of Holland in the form and under the title of a petition known as the *Remonstrantie*. They were thenceforth known as the Remonstrants. The corporation of theologians of Geneva, in a letter addressed to the synod of Dordrecht, compared the Remonstrants to thieves sneaking into a house on fire for the purpose of looting. The discussion was prolonged and stormy. The synod remained in session from the 13th December 1618 until the 19th May 1619, and Arminius was finally condemned at the fifty-seventh session on the 14th January. The two delegates from distant Geneva had been masters of the situation. Theodore Tronchin could thank the States-General for having 'proclaimed to all Europe the uniform agreement of the doctrine taught in all the reformed Churches and thereby stopped the mouth of the calumny which falsely reproached them with the variance of their teaching'. The Genevan theologians also insisted that the dissenters, that is to say the Arminians, should be severely punished. The fierce political rivalry between Maurice of Nassau and Oldenbarneveldt, the Advocate, still further complicated the theological debate. Oldenbarneveldt

was included in the general condemnation of Arminian doctrines and sentenced to death by fanatical judges. He died courageously by the axe of the executioner in the court of the Binnenhof on the 13th May 1619. 'Oh God!' he exclaimed at the sight of the scaffold, 'what a thing is man!' 'The cannon of Dordrecht', said the enraptured Diodati, 'have shot off the heads of the Remonstrants.' 'It was necessary', comments a historian, 'that those who had been loath to believe in the cruelty of God should have realized the cruelty of man'.

Geneva also condemned between 1635 and 1637 the doctrine of the French theologian, Moses Amyrault, which was known as *hypothetical universalism*, because to the rigid formula of Dordrecht, which taught God never desired to save all mankind either before or after the fall, he opposed the following attempt at conciliation 'God desired to save all men from all eternity *on condition of faith*' A formulary was imposed in 1647 in Geneva on candidates for the ministry and they were sworn to teach the absolute predestinationism of the synod of Dordrecht and to reject the thesis of the universality of grace, even conditional, as preached by Amyrault.

Rome was not so intolerant as Geneva, for Thomists and Molinists, who were discussing these abstruse problems of grace and predestination at the same time, were merely bidden to keep their respective opinions and refrain from censuring each other.

(e) *Holland* The Peace of Westphalia had definitively established the freedom of the *Republic of the Seven United Provinces*. But the republic had asserted its right to exist long before 1648, and evinced from the beginning the greatest intolerance towards Catholicism. The public practice of Catholic worship had been prohibited in fact in 1573. When the Calvinist troops entered the little town of Gorkum on the 26th June 1572 they arrested every ecclesiastic and religious they could find. Nineteen were hanged on the 9th July 1572, after a farcical trial, and their bodies horribly outraged. They were canonized by Pius IX in 1867. In 1583 Calvinism became the official religion of the new State, but it was not until 1648 that Catholicism was officially proscribed, priests expelled, and the churches handed

over to the Calvinists The feud between Arminians and Gomarists had cooled down in the Netherlands much more quickly than in Geneva As early as 1630 the two sides agreed to tolerate one another. But the multiplication of sects was not thereby prevented—rather the reverse As the influence of philosophical speculation became more prevalent and widespread, a certain elasticity of doctrine was engendered in men's minds The publishing and book-selling trade reaped the benefit Every work prohibited for political or religious reasons in other countries found willing printers and publishers in Holland

(f) *England* In the early years of Elizabeth's reign the main religious conflict had been that between the government and the Catholics The small fraction of the population which refused to accept the authority either of Pope or of queen had been looked upon as of minor importance During the first years of Elizabeth's reign this Puritan party, to whom 'new presbyter was but old priest writ large', who denied the right of any person to come as interpreter between the creature and his God, had been growing steadily in importance

After the defeat of the Armada in 1588 the government turned at once on the Catholics and executed twenty-nine of them Lord Arundel, now the leading lay Catholic in England, was thrown into the Tower, from which he was never to emerge. Yet the Catholics, weakened by persecution, by the miscarriage of their political plans, by their own disastrous quarrels between Jesuits and seculars, artfully fostered by Bancroft, the bishop of London, were no longer the protagonists in the quarrel The new battle that was to be joined was the battle between the State Church and the Puritans The first rumblings of that storm were heard in Elizabeth's reign in the Martin Marprelate tracts, in the somewhat ridiculous Hacket incident, even in the appeal of Essex to the city of London. The battle was not to be fairly joined until the time of Elizabeth's successor.

Both the Puritans and the Catholics had at the first high hopes of the favour of the new monarch. It was soon clear that the hopes of both were to be disappointed. James announced

his intention of enforcing all the penal laws against the Catholics and, although after the Jesuit Provincial, Henry Garnet, had revealed to him the Bye Plot to kidnap him, he in gratitude promised to relax his grim purpose, the rapid growth of recusancy and, perhaps the favour shown to Catholicism by his wife, Anne of Denmark, soon caused him to return to the full Elizabethan severity. The discovery in 1605 of a madcap plot, known as the Gunpowder Plot, concocted by a handful of Catholic gentlemen for the blowing up of king and Parliament seemed to many completely to justify such a return.

Official Catholicism was in no way implicated in that plot, and the execution of Henry Garnet, the Jesuit provincial, for alleged complicity in it was almost certainly a miscarriage of justice, yet James objected to the Catholics because the doctrine of Papal supremacy challenged the extreme Erastian theories on which he insisted. These theories allowed as little room for the Puritan claims to private judgement. James, who was possessed of some theological learning and imagined himself possessed of considerably more than he was, determined to settle the differences between Anglicans and Puritans by a conference at Hampton Court, over which he himself consented to preside. The conference was not a success. James, whose Scottish experience had left in him a strong distaste for the Presbyterian form of Church Government, faced the conference with the uncompromising aphorism of 'no bishop, no king'. He was shocked at the extreme nature of the Puritan claims. 'If that is all that they have to say', he said, 'I shall make them conform themselves or I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse.' The conference achieved little, save the making definite of the breach between Puritan and Anglican.

There is not space to follow through in detail the tangled and somewhat petty policies of this reign. Domestic politics showed an ever-widening breach in affairs political between Parliament, the institution of the moneyed classes, and the king, and in affairs religious, between the Puritans and the Church of England. The Puritans, no longer content merely to ask for toleration, began to attack the liberties of others in many ways,

notably to attack the old English and Christian custom of playing games on Sunday

Yet the King's hostility to the Puritans brought no notable alleviation of the lot of the Catholics. Their hope of alleviation lay in the granting of concessions to them as one of the terms of a marriage treaty between either the Prince Henry or the Prince Charles and a Spanish Infanta, but it was just this difficulty of religion, upon which, in spite of the efforts of the able Spanish ambassador, Gondomar, the marriage negotiations always broke down. Had they succeeded, one of the clauses of the treaty would have been the granting of toleration to English Catholics, but it is improbable that the Spaniards intended them to succeed. With the outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618, begun, as it was, by the claim of James's son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, to the Crown of Bohemia, domestic differences were still further complicated by foreign problems. James was for the traditional policy of friendship with Spain. The Puritan and parliamentary party, who wished England to play the part of leading Protestant nation in an anti-Catholic crusade, were clamorous against alliance with the great Catholic power, and at the same time determined that, whatever policy James pursued, he should only obtain money for pursuing it at the cost of considerable concessions of domestic power. In 1613 the negotiations for the Spanish marriage finally broke down, and with them, it seemed, the hopes of Catholic toleration. But Prince Charles almost immediately transferred his attentions from the Spanish to the French court, and Richelieu at once made demands for toleration as the price of the hand of Princess Henrietta Maria similar to those which the Spaniards had made as the price of the Infanta. An agreement was almost concluded when James died in 1625.

The accession of Charles I found the Protestants in England now fairly clearly divided into the two parties of Puritans, or those who admitted no religious authority save that of their own interpretation of the Bible, and Arminians, or Anglo-Catholics, to whom, as to the Puritans, the Bible was indeed the one infallible source of revelation, but who admitted the authority of

tradition on all matters on which Scripture did not speak plainly, and who, utterly though they differed from the Catholics on the fundamental question of authority, yet favoured the retention of much of the externals of Catholic worship. The Puritans were strong in Parliament, and the disputes which grew up between Parliament and king on questions of supply and which led to the impeachment of Charles's favourite, Buckingham, in 1626, were half-religious and half-political, the king standing for, and the Commons opposing, the policy of religious toleration. The great majority of the people of England belonged neither to the one religious party nor the other and disliked both the narrow Puritan intolerance and the extravagant monarchical claims to which the Anglo-Catholic party was unwise enough to lend its support.

The negotiations for the French marriage had been carried to a conclusion and Charles had agreed to Richelieu's demand for toleration for the Catholics. He was willing enough to do so, for he had no love of persecution in his nature. Yet at the same time he was far from his own master. Toleration was in Parliament's eyes the arch sin, and it therefore extracted from Charles a promise, that, in spite of all, he would continue to enforce the recusancy laws. For the moment the Catholics were left in an unpleasantly equivocal position. In the first two Parliaments of King Charles's reign coming events threw their shadows before them, but it was in his third Parliament, which met on the 17th March 1628 and was dissolved on the 10th March 1629, that the issues of the conflict were most clearly stated. It was that Parliament which compelled the consent of the king to the Petition of Right, by which the king was forbidden to exact 'any gift, loans, benevolence, tax, or such like charge without common consent by act of parliament' and which forbade the imprisonment of any one without cause shown. While it was sitting, the king's favourite, Buckingham, fell beneath an assassin's knife at Portsmouth, and—more important—it was the same period which saw the change of Wentworth from the side of Parliament to that of the king. The motives of this change are among the most debated in history.

The most charitable and the most probable explanation of it is that Wentworth, who had never had any sympathy with Puritan theology, saw that the religious differences between king and Parliament were deeper than the constitutional, and therefore took his stand with the side with which he sympathized on the more fundamental question.

From 1629 to 1640 Charles governed without a Parliament. Between the hatred of the king for political freedom and the hatred of the Puritanical Parliament for social and religious freedom, a quite impossible situation had arisen. The king, it is true, was naturally a favourer of his own autocracy, but apart from that he was a genuine and honest son of the Church of England, and it became ever increasingly obvious that, if he was to agree to receive his money only at the hands of Parliament, it would be given to him only on condition that he connived at the subversion of what he considered to be the divinely founded nature of his Church. He therefore determined to throw himself into the hands of Wentworth and Laud, first bishop of London and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, the leader of the Anglo-Catholic party, to govern without Parliament, and to raise money as best he might by a variety of dubious expedients, such as that of the application of the special royal privileges of forest law to areas which had long since ceased to be forest, or the collection in time of peace and from inland counties of ship-money. It was this latter expedient which led to the famous Hampden case in 1636.

Side by side with Charles's attempts to break the Parliamentary political party went the attempts of Archbishop Laud to impose Arminianism upon the Church. It led him to frequent conflict with the Puritans. In 1633 came the savage sentence on William Prynne, a Puritan barrister, for his bitter pamphlet, *Histriomastix*, in denunciation of the stage. In the next year Laud revived the old custom of a metropolitical visitation, which penetrated into every remotest corner of the province of Canterbury in search of heresy and disobedience. In 1631 a further verdict of libel was procured against Prynne and against two other Puritan writers, Burton, a clergyman, and Bastwick,

a physician. Bishop Williams, the anti-Laudian bishop of Lincoln, was thrown into prison

During these same years, while the law lay heavily upon the Puritans, the Catholics were experiencing milder treatment. The fault was not Laud's, who, in spite of what enemies of his own and a subsequent day have said, had no sympathy with Roman Catholicism. The fault was the queen's, who, in spite of Laud and the Puritans, appealed to Charles's marriage promises, kept her chapel open to all Catholics, and compelled Charles to receive a Papal agent, one Conn. The survival of English Catholicism throughout the seventeenth century is in a very great measure due to the sturdy faith of Henrietta Maria. The English Catholics themselves were too much weakened by the hopeless and inveterate feud between the regular and the secular clergy to have been able to accomplish much without her leadership.

It was the necessity of money for the prosecution of the war in which he had become involved with the Scotch which brought to an end Charles's period of personal government, and a Parliament was summoned for the 13th April 1640. But it had been elected in angry mood, and, showing itself determined not to vote supplies until grievances had first been remedied, was dissolved after three weeks of life.

Yet the King had to have money and could not get it save from Parliament. Before the year was out, he had, therefore, to summon another Parliament—the Parliament that was to be known to history as the Long Parliament, even as its predecessor is known as the Short. It was elected under the influence of a preposterous cry that it was the purpose of the king to restore the country to Catholicism. As a consequence its Puritan majority stood at one and the same time for a political programme of curbing the royal power, in which it was undoubtedly supported by the greater part of the nation, and for a religious programme of Puritanism which was as unpopular as political liberty was popular.

The first business which it undertook was the impeachment of Charles's minister, the great Strafford. It was only possible

to prove Strafford guilty of treason by a straining of the law as shameless as any in which Charles had ever indulged for the raising of money. Yet, if the king was to be fought, he must be robbed of his great minister. The Commons did not shrink from the task. Strafford was condemned, and to his eternal infamy Charles permitted his death. He was executed on the 12th May 1641.

In this, and in other purely political demands, the Parliament was almost of one mind. But when the Puritans proceeded to follow up their political victories by an attempt to abolish episcopacy, the House was at once divided into two almost equal parties. Puritanism was all but as unpopular as the royal prerogative, and the Bill was only passed by 139 votes to 108. Other Bills were passed in restraint of the ecclesiastical courts and in favour of a more savage persecution of the Catholics.

The Puritans had been elected to Parliament for their politics. The result of their attempt to use their membership for the imposition upon England of their religious notions was for the first time to create in England a considerable party in favour of Charles. England was beginning to discover in 1641 what Strafford had discovered in 1628, that, with Charles and the Puritans, it was necessary to make a choice between religious and political freedom, and that of the two religious freedom was the more important. The result of the first year of the Long Parliament was to make Charles more popular than he had ever been since his accession.

The catastrophe which converted strained relations into overt civil war was the Irish rebellion of 1641. The purpose of the rebellion was to expel from Ireland the hated English heretic, whether he were King's man or Parliament's man. Yet the Puritans, who were hardly sane on such matters, saw in it an excuse for more bitter attacks on all those in England who were, or who were thought to be, working for the coming triumph of the Pope—on the queen in particular and on the High Church bishops. Pym moved in Parliament that, if the king would not employ counsellors acceptable to Parliament, Parliament should only pay over money to its own officers.

whom it could trust. It was by now generally understood that political differences were but a cloak for more fundamental religious differences, and those who disliked Puritanism therefore opposed Pym's motion, which was only carried by 151 votes to 110. Even closer was the division on the Grand Remonstrance, by which, among other things, bishops were to be excluded from Parliament and Puritans treated with more indulgence, the voting being 159 to 148.

In reply to the Remonstrance, Charles would promise no more than that he would submit the problems of the Church to a national synod, which would, of course, be composed of clergymen. The bishops were insulted and prevented by the mob when they attempted to make their way to the House of Lords, and a rumour sprang up that the queen was to be impeached. Charles replied with his ill-advised and unsuccessful attempt to arrest the five leading Puritan members of Parliament, while the Parliament threw into prison some Kentish grand jurors who had offered a petition against Puritan innovations.

Many who were willing to criticize the king were not willing to fight against him. The extremist majority in Parliament, too, made the mistake of neglecting precedent and allowed the king, now under the influence of the wise and moderate Hyde, to pose as the conservative defender of the ancient liberties of England. Puritanism was as unpopular as ever. As a result, when Charles, after having been refused admission into Hull, unfurled his standard at Nottingham on the 22nd August, 1642, he had the support of the greater part of the people of England, of many who had been prominent critics of his earlier attempts to raise taxes without parliamentary sanction. Neither the geographical nor the social divisions between the two parties were absolutely clear cut, any more than are such divisions in the England of to-day. Yet roughly it is true to say that the greater numbers of peers and country gentlemen and their dependents were for the King, the merchants and manufacturers for the Parliament. Geographically, the north and west was generally for the king, the south and east for the

Parliament. The country divided itself upon lines little different from those by which in Elizabeth's reign it was divided between Catholic and Protestant. A majority of the people of England probably favoured the king. The Parliament, on the other hand, had three important advantages. they had London, they had the command of the sea, and the advantage of wealth was with them.

There is not space to recall the well-known story of the war. Suffice it to say that the earlier advantages were with the king. Among the Puritans dissensions broke out between the Presbyterians and the Independents. However, the intervention of the Scotch Presbyterian army and the formation of the New Model eventually gave the advantage to the Parliamentarians. By 1646 the king was defeated, and in April of that year he surrendered himself to the Scotch army at Southwell, preferring them to his English enemies.

The last two unhappy years of Charles's life he filled with ineffectual attempts to play off against one another, the three parties of the Scotch, the Independent army, and the Presbyterian Parliament. The result was a second and brief civil war, in which victory lay with Cromwell and his Ironsides. To play such a game successfully it is necessary to be quite unscrupulous and indifferent to anything but success. Charles was hampered by the sincerity of his belief in the divine institution of episcopacy. His intrigues effected little, unless indeed it was an achievement to compel the army chiefs to a 'purge' of the Parliament and thus expose the hypocrisy of the victors, who showed themselves ready to interfere with the elected representatives of the people with a grosser insolence than any of which a Stuart king had ever been guilty.

Charles was put upon his trial. His enemies selected 135 commissioners to try him, but even of such a carefully selected body only 62 appeared. Fairfax, the commander of the army, refused to attend, and only 58 eventually signed the death sentence.

In what sense sovereignty resides in the people, under what circumstances the people are justified in punishing their

monarch—these are large and debatable questions, but they have no bearing on the execution of Charles I. For that deed was not the work of the people of England, but of a minority of a minority which had cynically trampled on the very cause for which it itself had fought. The murderers of Charles had no kind of mandate to speak for the people of England. As Lady Fairfax said of that claim at the time, 'It is a lie, not a half or a quarter of the people of England'.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

By F. M. POWICKE

CONTENTS

I THE MEDIEVAL BACKGROUND OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND UNCERTAIN CONTEMPORARY OPINION SIR THOMAS MORE	353
II THE DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES <i>its nature, significance, and results</i>	373
III FROM THE LEGISLATION OF HENRY VIII TO THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI <i>The implications of the control of King in Parliament, illustrated by the method of the Henrician settlement The effects on canon law, the law of heresy, and the course of doctrinal developments</i>	382
IV CRANMER, GARDINER, AND POLE <i>The problem of conscience</i>	444
V THE ELIZABETHAN CHURCH <i>Government and parties</i>	462

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

I THE MEDIEVAL BACKGROUND OF THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND UNCERTAIN CONTEMPORARY OPINION. SIR THOMAS MORE

THE one definite thing which can be said about the Reformation in England is that it created a State-Church. The King became the head of the Church, the King in Parliament gave a sanction to the revised organization, formularies, liturgy, and even in some degree to the doctrine of the Church. The King's Council and Ministers took cognizance of ecclesiastical affairs. The King co-operated with the bishops and convocation in the government of the Church, and he appointed commissions to determine appeals in ecclesiastical cases. All this amounted to a revolution. In earlier times there had, of course, been constant co-operation between secular and ecclesiastical authorities in matters ecclesiastical. Movements of thought tending to the isolation of the two authorities from each other had not been successful in the Middle Ages. Although there was much difference of opinion about the origin and rights of secular authority, some saying that it had a divine sanction as part of the nature of things, others contending that after the coming of Christ it was derived from the successors of Christ, that is from the Church, and in particular from the Pope, very few were prepared to deprecate it, to regard it as a necessary evil. Indeed, in the best thought, human society was one, held together and inspired by belief in and obedience to God in a visible Church which comprised all Christian people, but also directed in this life by various kinds of secular authority. As is well known, idealists still believed in the necessity, if not in the actual existence, of a single secular ruler, to whom other rulers could look as subordinate authorities looked to them, but this theory was going out of fashion before the Reformation. In actual fact secular authority was bound up with the traditions of the group or community in which it resided; it could be regarded as democratic in its origin, although its justification depended upon its harmonious reaction to the moral law. But it was not sufficient

in or for itself It could not claim to lead its fraction of the whole Christian society in all the social activities of this life It was so important that its co-operation was desired, it might be so powerful that the limits which it imposed upon the activities of the ecclesiastical authorities—who were linked together under the Pope in the government of the whole society—might have to be treated with acquiescence or even made the matter of formal agreement, but, strictly speaking, such limitations were forms of usurpation For example, it was not unfitting that a King should have some voice in the election of a bishop, society was so intricate, secular and ecclesiastical functions so bound up together, that the royal licence to elect a bishop must be requested and given, and it was more than discourteous to elect a man who was not likely to be useful or was known to be distasteful to the King, or, again, friendly joint pressure on the part of King and Pope in favour of a particular candidate or a combined nomination actually overriding the electing body, might be advisable. But brutal insistence that such and such a man must be elected was a gross interference with canonical order It would be hard to say, here and in many other ways, where agreement ended and usurpation began. The tactful exercise of Papal authority, by the use of dispensations or of the Papal 'plenitude of power', was required all the time in the later Middle Ages to oil the wheels Yet that, ecclesiastically, society was one, greater than any political divisions, was a fundamental doctrine; nay, it was regarded as a natural fact. Hence the action of Henry VIII and his successors amounted to a revolution.

It is hard to resist the conclusion that the ease with which this revolution was effected was due to the prevalent system of compromise and not to any widespread belief in the necessity of change As we shall see later, the momentous step was so easy that its significance was not faced Facts, as usually happens, were more potent than theory, and when the time came for elaborate explanation, it was maintained that, as a matter of historic fact, the development of a united Christendom under Papal guidance had itself involved a gross usurpation of the rights of bodies politic, and that Christian unity was not bound

up with the supremacy of Rome. Indeed, so it was claimed, the usurpation of the Pope was such a monstrous perversion of the true nature of the Church as to stamp him as Antichrist. At first this re-reading of history was confined to a very few. Henry VIII and his Parliament were content with the statement, surprising enough to us, but a very significant description of policy, that 'by divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an Empire . . . governed by one supreme head and king . . . unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality, be bounden and ought to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience' In any 'cause of the law divine', it was within the power of the spirituality 'now being usually called the English Church' to declare and determine 'without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons'.¹ To maintain the independence of England as against any foreign interference was the first concern. Hence in 1534 a definite 'conclusion' was proposed in accordance with royal mandate to the convocations of Canterbury and York and to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, it was in the simple form 'Whether the Roman Pontiff has any greater jurisdiction bestowed on him by God in the Holy Scriptures in this realm of England than any other foreign bishop?' There were four votes in favour of papal jurisdiction in the convocation of Canterbury, none in that of York. But the problems which are raised by the attempt to observe the 'law divine' in an independent state, and still more by the attempt to base national policy on the teaching of Holy Scripture, were not faced at this stage. Yet they are the fundamental issues in the development of the Reformation.

The cause of a united Christendom was not left without witness; yet it is to be observed that, with two great exceptions, only two or three cartloads of monks were willing to die for it. One of these monks, Dr. Richard Reynolds of Sion Monastery, had some reason for asserting that at heart the greater part of the

¹ Act in restraint of appeals, 1533, 24 Hen. VIII, c. 12

kingdom was of their opinion, but opinion was not deep-rooted and was easily stifled by fear and bewilderment Even the friars, the old militia of the church, were divided, and the practical opposition of a few was soon checked The Carthusians, most remote from the world and also the least numerous in England of monks of the great medieval orders, were the most determined in opposition. The two great exceptions to the acquiescence of the laity and clergy were Bishop Fisher of Rochester and Sir Thomas More After sentence had been passed upon him, More, for the first time, gave free expression to his views No temporal lord could be head of the spirituality, just as a child cannot refuse obedience to his natural father, so the realm of England could not refuse obedience to the see of Rome His isolation signified nothing. for every bishop opposed to him, he could call upon a hundred saints, against every parliament he could appeal to the general councils of a thousand years. You have no authority, without the consent of Christendom, to make a law or act of Parliament contrary to the common body of Christendom

This was the witness of a man who had brooded long over the state of Christendom He was wise, witty, urbane; observant, critical, caustic, yet full of pity In his inner life he was austere, and could withdraw himself easily from the society in which he always shone, with a charm that captivated kings and bishops, nobles and all scholars, and brought him near to the common man He found every place home in which he could be near to God. He believed as easily and intimately in the communion of saints as the ordinary citizen believed in the reality of the passer-by who jostled him in the street Erasmus says of him that he talked with his friends about the future life as one speaking from the heart, with full hope, and it has been observed that what seemed to him 'the most terrible thing in the clamour for the plunder of church endowments was that it involved, not only social injustice, but the cessation of prayer for the dead': in his own words, 'that any Christian man could, for very pity, have founden in his heart to seek and study the means, whereby a Christian man should think it labour lost, to pray for all

Christian souls' The two cardinal tenets in the religion of Utopia are the belief in Divine Providence and in immortality.¹ Such was More in his inner life. But he was also a public man, shrewd and clear-sighted, compact of observation and pity. He had no illusions about the state of Europe. He was not a fanatical churchman, nor a thorough-going papalist. Indeed it would appear that at one time he was ready to welcome a general council which might even depose the Pope. He was a leader in the new learning and interested in the discovery and exploitation of the empty spaces of the earth. What he could not stand was the denial of the unity of Christendom, and that men should take advantage of the troubles of the time to decry this unity for the sake of power or money. He could see no rhyme or reason in the incessant wars, no justice in movements which spoiled the poor, no wisdom in the destruction of great institutions and ancient loyalties because they were not all that they should be. Hence, while nobody was more conscious than he of the impossibility, if not the folly, of trying to restrain the individual conscience, he was indignant against all disturbers of the peace in matters of opinion. There he was least in line with the new point of view. The state of things was so precarious, so many people were so headstrong, vain, ignorant, and irresponsible, fostering schisms which they could not control. In his public capacity he would naturally be expected to issue, and did issue, certificates which would give effect to the ecclesiastical law against heretics; although it is untrue that he actively set the law in motion—which was not his business—and insulted or persecuted heretics, he would see no inconsistency with his general outlook on life in the attempt to suppress the spread of Lutheran doctrines, especially if they were expressed with clamour or ostentation. With the perplexed, on the other hand, he was patient and persuasive, his own son-in-law was for a time, while a member of his household, attracted by the new views. Similarly, he took no public part in opposition to the

¹ R. W. Chambers, *The Saga and the Myth of Sir Thomas More*, 1926 (Proceedings of the British Academy). Those who have read this fine essay—with the historical background of which I do not altogether agree—will see how much I am indebted to it.

royal policy and its developments He refused to take the Oath of Supremacy, and rather than take it he died, but he would not have raised his voice if he had not been faced with the necessity of decision Only if we had been in his position could we tell if his conduct was too cautious, whether he delayed unduly in putting his principles of order and loyalty before his duty to God. In his *Utopia* he had conveyed his deepest convictions in the fanciful form congenial to a child of the new learning He was one of the first men to introduce the spirit of Plato into political discussion, but it never could have occurred to him, any more than it occurred to the long line of Platonic divines in the later Anglican Church, that his loyalty to the Church could be questioned His Utopian people were dressed in Franciscan garb They worshipped in the dark, mysterious, sumptuous churches which he loved. They recognized in European monasticism an institute with which they could sympathize. They would have nothing to do with violence and intransigence of thought It is possible to push the analogy between the society of Utopia and the society of united Christendom too far, but the two societies are not inconsistent in principle More wished to see, as so many idealists in the Middle Ages had wished to see, a really united and peaceful Christendom, striving energetically to prepare itself for the life with God, despising and rejecting capitalistic divisions in society, confident in the fundamental harmony of reason and beauty and law with the experience of the Church Such faith in the possibilities of the future may well astonish us For all his wit and shrewdness, Sir Thomas More was a dreamer, not reckoning enough with the untidy, disrespectful adventurousness in the spirit of man. He had no experience of the explosive power of conviction, whether it is right or wrong But he stands out as the one person who saw quite clearly what Henry VIII's revolution meant; and, in the contrast between him and the people about him, we can see how far religious society had drifted in the current of secularism and compromise from the acceptance of the medieval system, however irksome or imperfect, as beyond question. Other interests and loyalties were now so natural, so much a

matter of course, that, if need be, the old could go. The thoughtless could safely feel indifferent to them, not caring much what came to take their place. More's wife, Mistress Alice, could not understand why, for the sake of an oath, Master More should suffer himself to lie in a close filthy prison, shut up amongst mice and rats.

'Is not this house,' quoth he, 'as nigh heaven as mine own?' To whom she, after her accustomed homely fashion, not liking such talk, answered 'Tilly vally, Tilly vally.'

In the course of the century men gradually entered upon a view of life, or rather upon several views of life, very different from that of Sir Thomas More, though equally important in their eyes, and maintained with conviction and passion. Doubtless a few saw their way clearly, even in the early days of change. There had been little groups of men who at the universities had been inspired by the teaching of Luther. In various parts of England, for example in the Chiltern Hills and the Forest of Dean, were families which held Lollard views as part of their inheritance. The scepticism which frequently went with the new learning had in some minds, especially the minds of courtiers and men of affairs, given a sharper edge to religious indifference. But Sir Thomas More was undoubtedly right in thinking that he was faced by men who, for the most part, did not know and did not seem to care where they were going. The more light is thrown upon the feelings of men at this time, even of the inmates of monasteries, the clearer this incapacity for sustained conviction seems to be. There was widespread indignation against the King's treatment of Queen Catherine; the royal insistence that More and Fisher should declare themselves was probably due to the fear that, if criticism and passive resistance were not quelled in high quarters, the management of the public temper might become too difficult, yet the general acquiescence is one of the most mysterious things in our history, and remains, from the point of view of the historian, the chief explanation of the drastic treatment of the Church and the ruthless spoliation of the religious houses.

Our difficulty in comprehending the course of events is doubt-

less partly due to the fact that to the modern mind English history does seem to begin again with the Reformation. We can see the results of the revolution and we tend to suppose that they were equally obvious at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Our categories are more clearly defined, and as we find it hard to think of England as other than a Protestant country, so we are disposed to feel, if not to think, that the Reformation was, as it were, a rebound to the normal, and the more self-conscious because it appears to have been so easy. This attitude is nothing more than a form of our insular self-possession, and the ease with which King Henry made himself supreme was due to a situation precisely the opposite of that which we imagine. Ecclesiastical opinion had become distracted by a long indulgence in compromise. The work of the Church had been done under the direction, first of great missionaries and bishops, then of great popes supported by men who were ready to suffer in the cause of unity, because they saw that only through unity could the work of the Church be done. In the course of this work, the organization of the Church had been perfected under Papal leadership. Probably the last really big Englishman to see clearly what this achievement involved was Robert Grosseteste, the bishop of Lincoln, who died in 1253. He saw, as he felt, with all the energy of his being. He was puzzled and distressed to find that what was so clear to him was so hard for others. In his eyes rights and duties were but different sides of the same thing, easily to be understood in the light of Scripture, the revelation of that law of nature of which they were expressions. It might be necessary to disobey the Pope and to suffer the consequences, but to disobey the Pope in the interests of man was unthinkable. The Church had in its keeping the moral and spiritual welfare of its children; it had contrived a system of law and administration which, within its own sphere, was supreme; it could not, without treachery to God and dishonour to itself, acquiesce in any interference with its courts by the secular power. The secular power, though inferior in status, had been devised to co-operate with the ecclesiastical in one great society; it had its own duties, rights, and functions,

subject to the law of God, and within its scope all honour and obedience were due to it But in a case of conflict, whether in jurisdiction or policy, the ministers of God, and particularly the bishops, could not hesitate about the course they should take They should keep themselves at liberty, and, in accordance with the canons, refuse to involve themselves in secular business It was not for them to sit in secular courts as judges, they had their own duties, already hard enough, and if they did their work properly, even too much for them. So Grosseteste taught Yet, as one reads his correspondence, one sees that the effort to maintain the ecclesiastical system without compromise was hopeless To his colleagues, able and practical men as most of them were, this rigidity was tiresome. Why stress these dilemmas in a world already difficult enough? Here are two great powers for good, working together in God's service Why should a bishop not act as a secular judge? Why should he, and the Pope too, not do a good turn to a royal servant who deserved well of the King and was in need of a benefice? If, in all kinds of ways, the law which was being defined in the royal courts was inconsistent with the Canon Law administered in the ecclesiastical courts, why not come to some working agreement, so that squabbles about advowsons, and tithes and legitimacy and wills and all the rest of it may cease? There was no question of heresy, England was quite free from the dangerous unrest which prevailed from time to time in the Rhineland and north Italy, in Champagne, and the south of France. If English ecclesiastics were too logical and stiff-necked, they would provoke in court-circles and among their lay patrons a persistent anti-clericalism and be forced into much closer subservience to the Papal court than was pleasant. For if, on the one hand, they had to face at home the constant intervention of the King and his judges in ecclesiastical administration, they were, on the other hand, increasingly at the mercy of Papal demands for taxes and benefices. Hence the English clergy, who had a strong national sense, tended to acquiesce in a middle course. And, for the sake of peace, King and Pope tended in the same direction.

It is this tendency to compromise which has caused so much

misunderstanding and perplexity to historians of the medieval Church in England. Every one has been able to find, or to imagine that he had found, what he set out to find. The Puritan lawyers of the seventeenth century, led by the learned William Prynne, thought that they could trace in the Middle Ages the gradual vindication of the royal supremacy, or rather of the secular law, over the law and administration of the Church. The high churchman of a later day has often thought that he could establish the existence of an independent *ecclesia Anglicana*, whose system of law, while influenced by that of the universal Church, had its own sanctions. Both saw in the exercise of Papal control a kind of usurpation. They neglected or were unaware of the variety of local custom which was permitted to survive in various parts of the Church, and also of the element of compromise which existed in one form or another in every country, as well as in insular England, without prejudice to the belief in the essential unity of the Church. To-day it is hardly necessary to point out that compromise was practical and opportunist rather than a matter of principle. It was liable to interruption by the reassertion of principle at any time. It was like an uneasy truce between jurisdictions each of which claimed control over a strip of border territory, and it would have been unmeaning if the validity of each jurisdiction within its own domain had not been generally recognized. Yet the fact that both Puritan lawyers and high churchmen could see what they saw in medieval England is very significant. Their interpretations do reflect, with some distortion, the peculiarities of English ecclesiastical life after it ceased to be controlled by men like Grosseteste.

An adequate analysis of these peculiarities would require a discussion of English society as a legal and political organization. Here we must be brief. The main thing to be noted is the importance of the common law as an expression of the unity of England. In the later Middle Ages there was no State within the State. The laity in England, and also in other countries, had a parochial life and definite duties and responsibilities, social and moral, as members of the Church of Christ, but they had

no part in ecclesiastical organization. They were not faced by the dilemma of a decision between two forms of citizenship for the simple reason that the political organization was regarded as Christian, protecting the spiritual interests, not in opposition to them. If, for example, a man refused to accept the decision of an ecclesiastical court against him, he would be forced to obey by the secular power. In England the secular power was very penetrating. There were no ecclesiastical princes in England, no areas, with the exception (and from this point of view it was not a real exception) of the bishopric of Durham, in which a bishop or abbot was supreme, for the immunities of a great ecclesiastic were not marks of sovereignty, but of delegated royal power. Within his 'liberty', if he had one, he exercised the functions of sheriff or bailiff of the hundred, or, to put the matter more precisely, his officials took the place of royal officials and he received certain dues which were normally paid into the royal exchequer. He lived under the direction of the royal courts, within the sphere of the common law. Moreover he might be involved in secular duties, like any other citizen, as a minister of state, a royal commissioner, a member of the Great Council or House of Lords. His local prestige did not help him when he sat in the convocation of the clergy. Hence, although we hear a great deal about the *ecclesia Anglicana* we can trace no tradition in England of an organized body or church with an independent claim or status. As Maitland pointed out, the conciliar movement passed almost unnoticed in England. At one time there had been a possibility of a locally organized Christendom, in which the English convocation with its representative system of the clergy might have played a part, but in the fifteenth century we find nothing which corresponds in England to that movement in France which later, in co-operation with the Crown, was to shape the system of 'Gallican liberties'. Many of the clergy, many old established institutions like the Benedictine monastery of St. Albans, doubtless felt as definitely as the laymen that they belonged to England rather than to Rome. They were Englishmen, with an Englishman's dislike of the foreigner. They hated Papal taxation and Papal

interference with the rights of patronage. They acquiesced cheerfully in the limitations imposed by the common law upon the operations of the ecclesiastical courts, just as they expected to be protected in their exemptions and privileges as clerics. In the ordinary life of every day they felt no incoherence, no difficulty, but this was because they were English, not because they had worked out any theory of a separate English Church. And in the same way they accepted the church order of a united Christendom under a Pope because it was the only conceivable order, and because they had no more inclination to heresy than they had to treason. The common law of England and the King accepted it all, with one all-important proviso. The King and the Pope worked together. The Papal powers, as they grew, were at the King's service for the reward of his friends and servants. The whole system of Papal taxation, so laboriously developed in defence of the Holy Land, was gradually changed into and lay at the root of the methods by which the clergy taxed themselves for the service of the Crown. When Papal provisions were most numerous the King and his barons and clerks got their share; when Papal taxation was at its height, more than 90 per cent of the proceeds were granted to the Crown by the Pope.¹ Appeals to the Roman Curia were useful to everybody. Why, then, should the clergy seek any other way of life? How could they, even if they wished, and they did not wish, to do so? They were not ultramontanists, but were papists. They were not nationalists, but they were very insular and English.

The King and the courts, I have said, made one very important reservation in their accommodating relations with the Curia. They were resolute in resisting any interference with their control of real property, including the rights of advowsons. The privileges of clergy, the jurisdiction in questions of marriage,

¹ 'Of the total yield of tenths paid by the clergy of England and Wales at the papal order during the reign of Edward II the king received nearly 92 per cent and the papacy eight. Of the total of about £255,000 which Edward secured from subsidies paid to him by the clergy of England and Wales twenty-five per cent was levied at the grant of the clergy and seventy-five per cent at the papal order.' Professor W. E. Lunt, in *Haskins Anniversary Essays* (Boston, 1929), p. 182.

and the disposition of personal property by will, the rights of visitation and, on the whole, of discipline—these were generally respected or made the subject of agreement. But the control of the advowson, claimed in the Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164, was regarded as fundamental, and round it gathered the claim to lordship, the rejection of foreign jurisdiction, the claims of the laity as against the clergy, and the other forces which led to the ultimate assertion of the sovereignty of the King in Parliament over ecclesiastical affairs. Here, indeed, we may find one of the strongest tendencies in the development of the national state. King and barons successfully asserted their prerogatives and privileges against any Papal interference with their rights of presentation, and in asserting them acquired a livelier consciousness of their significance, and gave a wider meaning to them. A first step was the claim that, historically, benefices and ecclesiastical corporations, though they might draw their life from elsewhere, owed their existence to the benefactions of the Crown and the nobles. A next step, not maintained nor universally taken, but taken by some from time to time, was the assertion of the right to deprive the church of its property, as when in 1404 some knights of the shire suggested that the land of the clergy should for one year be taken into the King's hands for the purposes of the war. It would not be difficult to trace the connexion between such ideas and the objection to the possession of property in England by alien priories or ecclesiastics, to the shipment of money to ecclesiastics across the sea, to ecclesiastical legislation which conflicted with the law of the land, to the claim of the clergy that they were not bound by laws to which they had not assented, and, above all, to the exercise of foreign jurisdiction affecting the rights of the crown and the functions of the royal courts. The terrible weapon of *praemunire*, under whose threat the Reformation settlement was carried through, had its humble beginnings as a method of procedure against elusive persons who defied the jurisdiction of the royal courts in cases where Papal claims to provision had affected royal rights; it was merely subsidiary to the Statute of Provisors, just as the Statute of Provisors was

merely intended to strengthen the hands of the royal judges in their administration of the law. This legislation could be and frequently was made inoperative by royal dispensation, if it suited the Crown not to act upon it. Gradually the Statutes of *Praemunire* were interpreted to justify action against the exercise of foreign or private jurisdiction without royal consent. The threat of *praemunire*, with its penalties of deprivation, was used by Henry VIII against the whole clergy on the ground that they had acquiesced in the legatine jurisdiction of Cardinal Wolsey, a jurisdiction which the clergy had cause to detest and which the King had both favoured and helped to procure for the great minister. And the clergy had neither the power nor the temper to resist.

While compromise between ecclesiastical and secular authority had produced an insular complexity in social relationships, it had done nothing to develop, but rather had hindered the possibility of a national religious consciousness. King and clergy alike had freely availed themselves of the Papal power, while resenting, in different ways, arbitrary interference from Rome. Laity and clergy were inextricably involved in a common social system, yet anti-clericalism, in the form of general suspicion rather than of personal class feeling, had grown stronger. The Papacy, driven along by force of circumstances, had in its turn acquiesced in a situation which tended to the advantage of the royal power because it emphasized the independence of the royal courts and the self-consciousness of the laity. By an ironic change of circumstance, the last great Papal legate in England revealed the absence of moral and logical coherence in ecclesiastical society. As one writer has observed, Thomas Cromwell had seen his former master Wolsey 'use his position as cardinal and legate to intercept, as it were, the stream of ecclesiastical administration in its natural course between England and Rome by deciding most of the appeals himself, though always professedly as the Pope's delegate, and thus concentrating in his own hands the power of the Church. The state of things which Wolsey had thus brought about as a temporary phenomenon Cromwell proposed to render permanent and normal', that is to

say, by transferring all this power to the King¹. On the other hand, Wolsey's jurisdiction had alienated the clergy because it had meant daily interference with their administrative powers. Warham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Fisher of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More had all disliked or been shocked by the career of the legate. In the document which he signed when he fell from power Wolsey acknowledged that on the authority of bulls obtained by him from Rome he had 'unlawfully vexed the greater number of the prelates of this realm and of the king's subjects, thereby incurring the penalties of praemunire'. He had been clear-sighted enough to see, as time went on, that if he could not retain his hold upon the King, the Church in England would be involved in his downfall. He had *not* realized the effect of his policy in weakening such strength and independence as the prelates still possessed. The weapon which was used against him could be used against them, and they found themselves powerless to resist. Indeed, many of the clergy were in fact relieved. They had lost touch with Rome; they could not lose touch with King Henry.

The perplexity of the clergy when they were brought face to face with the great issues raised by the crown must have been great in the extreme. The long-drawn-out discussions about the divorce, the ill feeling aroused by the legation of Wolsey, the conflicts between royal and Papal claims to supremacy, all came together, stirring argument and passion, yet they had no logical coherence with each other. A man might sympathize with Queen Catherine and yet be indifferent to the claims of Rome, or be a strong Papalist and at the same time hope that the King would get his divorce. He might be willing to die for the unity of the Church, yet rejoice in the fall of the Cardinal. And in addition to these issues, drawing them first here, now there, still more distracting, because more subtle, influences were working upon the clergy. These were the days of the 'new learning'. In the more contemptuous speech of the time the new

¹ G W Child, *Church and State under the Tudors* (London, 1890), pp. 48, 49. This point of view has been taken independently by Professor A F Pollard, in his important biography of Wolsey (London, 1929) and worked out more fully, cf. especially p. 215.

learning was the newfangled teaching brought from Germany and disseminated by a few pernicious books Making its way with a more powerful impetus than the old Lollard doctrines had ever acquired, it advocated very much the same thing. It upheld the sufficiency of Scripture, drew a distinction between the faithful who formed the true and hidden Church and the 'idolatrous' majority of all grades of learning and position, insisted upon the folly of pilgrimages and image worship and like superstitions In the days to come, when Protestantism was in power, this new learning was acclaimed by Latimer as really the old learning, the true teaching, and the opprobrious epithet 'new' was hotly repudiated But we can justly use the phrase in a much wider sense to include these and all the other ideas and tendencies which were influencing the minds of men At all times of intellectual activity in the history of the Church there have been conflicting cross-currents at work among the clergy and, in growing measure, among the laity; but the cross-currents had never been so many nor the conflict so apparent as in the early years of the sixteenth century. Throughout the fifteenth century there had been much criticism and much apologetic, and the apologetic had sometimes been as provoking as the criticism. No Englishman had criticized the abuses in the Church more fiercely than the rigid conservative Gascoigne, Chancellor of the University of Oxford, no apologist had been so active as the independent-minded bishop of Chichester, Reginald Pecock And the critic, firm in his orthodoxy, had helped to fasten upon the apologist the charge of heresy, not because he had defended abuses but because in their defence he had surrendered the main position. Both men had hated Lollardy, but denunciation both of Lollards and of the evils which gave plausibility to their views was safer than misguided attempts to convert them Pecock had relied upon his cleverness rather than upon the tradition secured by the saints of old. In the middle of the fifteenth century it had not been difficult to crush cleverness of his kind; but fifty years later intellectual agility was more common, more varied and subtle, more unchecked It covered a wider field, so that any man could find arguments to prove the rightness of the things

he desired So we find the nimble-witted king, while never giving himself away, protecting a man who would write on the lawfulness of expropriating the clergy, and another who would maintain the principle of absolute sovereignty It is quite a mistake to suppose that this spirit of independence was confined to one party, for there was no party. Holiness and self-seeking, cleverness and obscurantism can be found side by side among men of all ways of thinking There was at first little heresy in the new studies at Cambridge, described by Erasmus with such pleasure in a famous letter Cambridge was to produce the great reforming prelates and divines, but at first the return to the humanities involved no discord between the old faith and reason Indeed, the suspicion of learning as such was far more apparent among the advocates of the 'new learning' in its narrow heretical sense, and Sir Thomas More, in his *Dialogue concerning Heresies* (1527), used all his ingenuity and wit to show that reason is the servant and not the enemy of faith This is how he describes the outlook of the messenger with whom he was to discuss.

And thereupon perceiving him to have your sons at school, inquiring further of him, to what faculty he had most given his study, I understood him to have given diligence to the latin tongue As for other faculties he wrought not of For he told me merrily that Logic he reckoned for babbling, Music to serve for fingers, Arithmetic meet for merchants, geometry for masons, astronomy good for no man, and as for Philosophy, the most vanity of all, and that it and logic had lost all good divinity with the subtleties of their questions, and babbling of their disputation, *building all upon reason, which rather giveth blindness than any light* For man (he said) hath no light but of holy scripture

As we read the history of the time we soon cease to look for any clear-cut divisions or to be surprised by the way a man would think. The career of Henry Standish, Provincial of the Grey Friars, is illuminating He was a strong churchman, a judge of heretics, a bitter critic of Erasmus, one of the official defenders of Queen Catherine during her so-called trial, and only at the end of his life (1535) showed his readiness to accept the royal

supremacy in the Church; yet this description alone would give a very misleading idea of the man. Early in the young king's reign he won favour as a court preacher and became one of Henry's advisers. The Pope made him Bishop of St Asaph in 1518 to please the King. And he is best known in history for his stand, in 1515, on behalf of the rights of the secular courts to try the clergy, and to disregard Papal bulls which were contrary to the public interest. Parliament had recently renewed a Statute—a temporary measure passed in 1512—depriving murderers and robbers in minor orders of benefit of clergy, a well-known abbot, Richard Kidderminster of Winchcombe, had defended the immunity of the clergy in a sermon preached at St Paul's Cross. The feeling against clerical privilege was at this time running high, and in reply the bishops were closing their ranks. There was nothing new in such a situation—a wave of anti-clericalism on the one side, a clerical rally on the other. When the abbot's sermon was brought to his attention, the King was interested and a discussion was arranged at Blackfriars, at which Henry and his judges were present. Standish, the head of the Franciscans in England and the court preacher, argued the case against the Benedictine, and here we do feel a new atmosphere. The public welfare, Standish maintained, was the main consideration, Papal decrees (and in this instance the canonical system was involved) had not been received in England and were often disregarded even by bishops. Here the old spirit of compromise between ecclesiastical and spiritual jurisdiction is given higher significance as a historical fact, vindicating the superior rights of the common well-being. It needed little to turn the argument of this follower of St Francis into a claim for royal supremacy. When convocation proceeded against Standish, ostensibly on the ground of similar utterances in sermons and lectures, the King went further. The case against him was again brought out of the control of the clergy to the jurisdiction of king and judges. It needed little more to make the King the judge in matters of heresy. But here I am not concerned with the revelation of his prerogative given to a shrewd young king of twenty-four years of age, but with the outlook of an orthodox

friar of long experience upon one of the crucial issues in the relations between Church and State. It helps us to understand the position of a strong-willed man like Gardiner and the perplexities of Cranmer. For, once latent dilemmas were brought into the open and a decision was forced, it was impossible to rely upon clerical opinion. There was no clear tradition of common action.

For the same reason it is very hard to find one's way in the story of the early trials for heresy. Not very many suffered death. Some heretics were disregarded as harmless cranks, others, doubtless, were protected by their own discretion. Of the two best known, Bilney and Frith, the former was convicted for his attacks upon images and pilgrimages, the general hypocrisy and pride and futility in the Church, the other because of his views on the Mass. 'Little Bilney' became a hero in later Protestant circles, but, considered in the light of the affectionate recollections of his friend Latimer and the pitying but ruthless analysis of his case given by Sir Thomas More, he is a very pathetic figure. He was not at all like the usual disciple of the new learning. He was a curious mixture of self-confidence and timidity, unbalanced yet buoyed up by 'scrupulous holiness'. More says of him 'wherein him liked he set himself at liberty'. He could not remain firm and he could not let things be. Too able and persuasive to be disregarded, he had no stability, yet he was neither a coward nor was he carried away by self-importance. Now sad with servile dread, now uplifted with 'the vain gladness of heart which he took for spiritual consolation', first recanting, then tormented by conscience, he seems to reflect the perplexity of his time, as the cross-currents of life swept over his serious and sensitive but puzzled soul. Strange echoes of apocalyptic fury against the Papacy, the powerful impression made by Tyndale's writings, hatred of idolatrous roods and dainty singing and all the pomp and vanity of clerical life mingled with his firm belief in the central dogmas of the Church. A sense of helpless dependence upon the Church fought with his passion for preaching and his certainty of the experience which he had found in the Scriptures. And so in 1531, after

receiving much consideration, he was burned as a relapsed heretic. He is so significant because he was so much better than the people about him. He could not merely be critical and cynical, and shrug his shoulders or take up one popular cry after another. He was not, like so many medieval heretics of his type, an exception in a world which was sure of itself, he was an exceptionally serious man in a world which was not sure of itself and yet did not much care, because it was conscious of the strength and energy and freedom in itself, a world in which cruelty and cynicism had free play, and indifference did not matter, yet a world in which self-assertiveness was almost indistinguishable from the craving after experience, whether of beauty or adventure or sheer evil. It was an exciting, though very dangerous, time for the men with ideas, and a good time for those who wanted to see what would happen. Sir Thomas More, secure in the citadel of his well-ordered integrity, was not quite just to the people who found life very perplexing, but he does remind us of the element of self-importance and excitement always to be found among the reformers in such an age as his; he saw very little good in the 'ardent appetite to preach' and tells of one of the new kind of preachers who attributed bad preaching to the lack of persecution. This man wished to see strife and business arise upon their preaching. 'The fruit of strife among the hearers and persecution of the preacher cannot lightly grow among Christian men but by the preaching of some strange novelties and bringing up of some newfangled heresies to the infection of our old faith.' He knew a man who, after being convinced of error, was filled with such an open passion of shame when he came among the people who held him in esteem, that he revoked his revocation. After a time, the books which had convinced him of error were brought to him again, and he himself read them before the people 'so that he perceived the audience that stood about him to feel and understand his proud folly'. So he yielded himself again 'Such secret pride had our ghostly enemy conveyed in to the heart of him, which, I ensure you, seemed in all his other outward manners as meek a simple soul as a man should have seen in a summer's day.'

II THE DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES

This atmosphere of uncertainty and unrest is felt at once when we turn to the monastic life. The fall of the monasteries (1536-40) comes later in the first stage of ecclesiastical revolution, but its story is so closely linked with what had gone before and with the intangible changes of thought and outlook in society that it may appropriately be discussed here. No aspect of the Reformation has been so hotly and inconclusively debated, yet no one, whatever view he may take, would deny that in a perplexing age this is the most perplexing of subjects. The evidence itself is as perplexing as it is extensive. The historian cannot form from it a coherent impression of what the monks thought about the change, nor of what their neighbours thought. Some well-documented books have been written which give us a picture of a popular healthy element in social and religious society, mysteriously crushed out of existence by greed. Other equally well-documented books give us a picture of a corrupt survival in the body politic cut away to the general relief. Both kinds of book tend to heighten the dramatic quality of their story by giving it in a setting of excitement and passion, as though an exotic and morbid experience had disturbed the national life. Yet, if we try to look at the passing of the monasteries as a whole, we get quite a different impression. The great change, involving the extinction of about 550 houses and the dispersion of some 7,000 religious (excluding the friars), was carried through in characteristic English fashion. It was exceedingly business-like, yet not pedantic, smooth in some places, rough in others, comic here and tragic there, but generally humdrum and unsentimental. There was little physical disturbance with the life of the shires, and far less scrambling for land or displacement of local interest than is usually supposed. The monks got livings or pensions, many of the abbots and priors became secular dignitaries and ended their days as bishops and deans. The financial transactions required for the raising of the purchase price of such an extensive mass of property—for most of the monastic lands were sold at their estimated value—

no doubt involved social changes which have not yet been adequately explored, but it would seem that the country gentry, who were more familiar with the properties and had helped to manage them, as often as not succeeded in buying them. The percentage of arable land was high, and the lay element which had served the monastic establishments would, on the whole, not find much difficulty in finding employment.

This description may sound surprising, and in any case requires some amplification if it is not to be misleading. It is important to bear in mind the nature of the monastic economy and also the methods of which the State could avail itself in the work of centralized supervision. The connexion between the monasteries and the neighbouring laity had always been very close. I have already had occasion to observe that in the three previous centuries the barons and gentry had frequently insisted upon their part in the creation of ecclesiastical endowments, and their feeling that they had not lost all control of the gifts of their ancestors was as strong in their attitude to the regular as it was in their attitude to the secular clergy. It was recognized in some measure at the time of the dissolution—the representatives of founders and donors were secured in their right to retain any fixed income still payable to them—and it was not overlooked by the great commentators on the common law. But in the nature of things argument of this kind was largely a political gesture and had little relation to facts in the beginning of the sixteenth century. The share taken by the neighbouring laity in the actual administration of monastic property and the consequent intimacy of social relations between the monasteries and the local inhabitants were much more important. Some great noblemen, such as the duke of Suffolk and the earl of Shrewsbury, acted through their officials as stewards of half a dozen or more monasteries, and in most cases a county gentleman of standing held this position. The auditors, receivers, and bailiffs were usually laymen. A great part of the monastic lands were leased to laymen. On the other hand, in return for definitely arranged benefactions, laymen might be received into the monastery or their children brought up within its walls.

Local gentry, for years before the dissolution, had been given monastic advowsons as unacknowledged trustees, under an obligation to present monks, who had received their 'capacities', to the livings as incumbents. The transition to the new order was made easy by this traditional concern of the laity in monastic affairs. The 'spoliation' did not imply a cataclysm so much as an infinite series of adjustments. If a layman received a monastery as a gift from the Crown he was responsible for the pensions of the monks, and in some cases he had to pay even more than he got in annual revenue. Moreover, examination of the financial survey has shown that the number of laymen dependent upon the monasteries and the amount of 'charity' which the monks administered has been over-estimated. Just as many of the monks and nuns were of wealthy or gentle origin, so were many of their pensioners. At the most thirty-five thousand laymen were fed in monasteries, including the officials and servants who could find employment elsewhere. The amount of alms officially recognized, and therefore free from taxation, was about 3 per cent. of the monastic budget, and this was mainly expended in food for the poor who gathered on fixed days in the year. The dissolution must have caused much suffering and inconvenience, but it did not create a proletariat. The distress must have varied greatly in different parts of the country, in some places hardly noticeable, severe in others—especially in the lonely places where the hospitality of the monks was a real boon to travellers, and monastic ministrations to the poor were their only alleviation. The social significance of a big abbey in a wild and thinly populated area was one thing, the value to the community of a group of houses, of all sizes and shades of decrepitude, in a busy and well-populated shire was a very different thing. The seven thousand persons under monastic vows were scattered in tiny communities among a population of three or four million. Their economic interests were interlocked with those of their neighbours and were in the main administered by laymen.

If the disposal of the monastic lands and houses had been left to local control there would doubtless have been more give and

take than there was. In many places the monks had the goodwill of their neighbours and so far as was possible were shown consideration. Even Latimer, the bishop of Worcester, had his friends among them and spoke up on behalf of men who, apart from their 'monkery', could still take a valuable part in local life if they were allowed to retain their positions under different conditions. But such a method of dealing with the problem would have had great disadvantages: it would have involved more suffering, intrigue, and scrambling for wealth, a struggle long drawn out between conflicting interests. In any case, it was quite impossible, for the suppression of the monasteries was a great act of State—the first assertion on a large scale by the Tudor monarchy of its competence to put parliamentary legislation in domestic affairs into action. The first stage in the dissolution was contemporary with the absorption of Papal into royal interests in the financial administration of the Church.

The abolition of the annates or first-fruits, the payments made to the Papal Curia on all sorts of occasions, as a result of papal provision to prelacies and benefices,¹ had been effected in 1534, in accordance with a Statute of 1532, and had been demanded by clergy and laity alike. But in the next year, 1535, after the royal supremacy had been secured (Nov 1534), the King's right to these payments was declared. They were extended to all benefices and at the same time ecclesiastical taxes or tenths were made annual and permanent. This change was accompanied by a commission of inquiry into all ecclesiastical revenues—a new and exhaustive assessment which in its operation was very like the Papal investigations of the thirteenth century which hitherto had been the basis of ecclesiastical taxation by King and Pope. The result was the valuation returns which were worked up into the famous *Valor Ecclesiasticus*. Hence, when in 1535 the great visitation of the monasteries was undertaken under the supervision of Thomas Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General for ecclesiastical affairs,

¹ By this time the term 'annates' was used to comprise both annates proper, paid by clergy papally provided to benefices of a certain value, and the older 'services' paid by prelates to Pope and Cardinals, when for various reasons they had been appointed in consistory, i.e. by Pope and Cardinals.

the Crown had already in its possession a survey of monastic wealth and was using for the material control of the whole Church all the machinery of government, all the experience acquired by exchequer and chancery during the previous centuries King Henry had convinced himself that, if he were not the source of doctrine, he was the judge in all things ecclesiastical, could appoint and deprive bishops, say what doctrine was right and what wrong, reform the Canon Law, and, through Parliament, control the property of the clergy The dissolution of the smaller monasteries, which followed Cromwell's visitation, was the most drastic expression ever seen in England of the new theory of the secular state. By the Act of 1536 (27 Henry VIII, c. 28) the actual and real possessions of all the monastic houses 'which have not in lands, tenements, rents, tithes, portions, and hereditaments, above the clear yearly value of two hundred pounds' passed into the King's hands. The vested interests in fixed payments and offices were secured, the claims of creditors were to be satisfied, the heads of houses and the monks and nuns provided for, but no other proprietary rights than those of the Crown were to be permitted. In one respect this Statute may justly be said to signify an important advance in the development of the sovereignty of King in Parliament. Hitherto, when property for any reason fell to the Crown, the King could not acquire or enjoy his legal title until a local jury had allowed it (Statutes 8 Henry VI, c. 16, and 18 Henry VI, c. 6). If the new Statute had been vaguely worded, all sorts of claims to ownership in the religious houses might well have arisen to restrain the rights of the Crown The Act of Parliament would have become the subject of discussion in the courts, to be interpreted in the light of other evidence and the rules of common law But Henry and his advisers had anticipated this contingency. It is probable that the isolated and rather mysterious surrender in 1532 of the important priory of Austin Canons at Aldgate, in London, was designed or at least used to secure the position of the King.¹ A special Act of Parliament confirmed the procedure

¹ See the important paper by Miss Jeffries Davis, 'The Beginning of the Dissolution', in *The Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series, viii (1925), 127-50

of surrender and gave Henry and his successors full enjoyment of the property, 'as though office and offices had been duly found thereof according to the laws of this realm', that is to say, the Statutes of Henry VI. In Fuller's phrase, the confiscation 'shrewdly shook the freehold of all abbeys'. However this may be, in the Act of 1536 the rights of others than the King were definitely excluded, and 'such as pretend to be founders, patrons, and donors' were, in company with abbots and other governors of religious houses, excluded from all rights or interests other than such fixed annual payments as practice allowed them. The supremacy of the King in Parliament was secured, and henceforth any purchaser or grantee of monastic lands had a secure title from the Crown. The returns in the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* were supplemented by careful local investigation into the value of all property so disposed of, and the entire administration of this new wealth of the Crown was vested in a new department, the Court of Augmentations, and ultimately in the Exchequer. Although much intrigue and corruption infected this administration, it was carried on with all the minute care which had become second nature in the departments of state. The valuations were recorded in detail, and the local officials of the Augmentation office paid the pensions of the dispossessed monks in due form every half year. How carefully the whole transaction had been considered appears from the clause in the Act that future owners or lessees of monastic property should be bound, under penalties, to keep 'an honest continual house and household in the same site or precinct, and to occupy yearly as much of the same demesnes in ploughing and tillage of husbandry'. But in this respect continuity of the domestic economy and hospitality of the monasteries was too much to be hoped for. The temptation to buy monastic lands in the hope of a profit, either by selling again or by rack-renting or recourse to more remunerative methods of exploitation, was very often too severe. The new owners had generally paid a full price, and must have included in their number many strangers and new capitalists. It is very easy to exaggerate the effect of the dissolution in hastening economic change, for the monasteries had naturally

had no clear policy of their own, and this change had widespread causes, quite independent of the monastic economy. But the transfer of so much land and local interest to laymen whose rights were protected by the Crown and were dependent upon the new settlement in Church and State did much to shake the traditional order of things, to break down the old connexions in local life, and to give a powerful vested interest in the maintenance of the royal supremacy.

As an annihilation of ancient rights, the Dissolution of the Monasteries was an act of absolute power; but it was not an act of irresponsible power. It was part of a sweeping reconstruction of the Church in England. There is some evidence for the belief that not long before the King had played with the idea of a general spoliation of the Church, in which salaried bishops and clergy, as in modern France, would have taken their place beside the pensioned religious. When it is regarded as part of a wide plan for the development of educational and social services, as the idealists like Latimer desired, and for the reorganization of the diocesan system, as was in fact in part achieved by the foundation of the new bishoprics of Westminster, Gloucester, Oxford and Chester, Peterborough and Bristol, and by a large increase in the number of suffragan bishops, this bold scheme had real merit, but performance lagged far behind the promise to convert monastic wealth to better uses, and it was a good thing that the plan for a general confiscation did not come to anything. It was too revolutionary in the sixteenth, as it had been in the fifteenth century. Yet at a time when such proposals could be seriously discussed, and when so much was accomplished, it is as misleading to isolate the Dissolution as a piece of wanton tyranny, as it is misleading to isolate the monks from their neighbours and to regard them as immune from the influence of current opinion. The fall of the smaller monasteries helped to precipitate the movement in Lincolnshire and the north of England, known as the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536), just as the Act of Uniformity in Edward VI's reign (1549) brought the discontent in the west of England to a head; but it is quite clear that the Pilgrimage of Grace, rightly described

by Mr. Fisher as a demonstration rather than a rebellion, was directed against the 'new learning' and the injunctions and interference of the Vicar-General as much as against the Dissolution. In England as a whole there was excitement, and much consternation, but no opposition. Nor, on the other hand, was there any widespread indignation against the monastic orders and the monks. The horror of monastic depravity which is expressed in the Act of 1535 was not a true reflection of popular opinion. The revelations of Cromwell's unsavoury commissioners were discounted by the findings of the commission which administered the Act. There had always been laxity in the monastic life since the first enthusiasm had passed. The revelations of episcopal visitations in the fifteenth century are very like those of the thirteenth, and the state of the monasteries in 1535 was, if we consider only grave scandals, probably not much worse. If there had been widespread sympathy with monastic aims, there is no reason why drastic reform—the elimination of tiny and useless houses, the grouping of others, the revision and enforcements of the Rules—should not have taken the place of abolition. Proposals of this kind had been in the air for a generation. Wolsey and others had made a beginning with Papal approval. The injunctions of the commissioners themselves seemed to contemplate reform. The success of Abbot Kidderminster's organization of monastic studies at Winchcombe showed that much could be made of the existing system. A strong king, supported by a determined episcopate, might have carried through with infinitely greater effect the kind of reform which was attempted in the Cluniac Order by John of Bourbon, bishop of Puy and abbot of Cluny, in the second half of the fifteenth century. But it is clear that the desire was lacking, both within and without the monasteries. There was no very strong feeling against them except among the Reformers; the neighbourly instincts which prompt men to dislike change would, if they had been undisturbed, have been sufficient to protect them, but there was little strong belief in them and no intention of fighting for them. And within their walls, when the issue was once raised, and the bearing of the

royal policy was realized, there was in most places no closing of the ranks, no passion of opposition. Rather, old feuds and differences and jealousies were enlarged and embittered. The 'new learning' had itself penetrated into some abbeys and was influencing the younger monks. The new 'lecturers' introduced by bishops like Latimer had added to the confusion. There was general reluctance to move, and the majority undoubtedly disliked the trend of events, but they were demoralized by uncertainty, made fearful by gossip and intrigue among themselves. They found it wiser to come to terms, to look out for livings, or take their pensions. The abbots and priors were comfortably provided for, a dozen or so became bishops, others suffragans, others the deans of the cathedral chapters of secular clergy into which their old foundations—Carlisle, Durham, Ely, Norwich, Rochester, Winchester—were converted. Some married and founded county families, on the strength of their pluralities. Their monks followed suit, as incumbents or pensioners, and several of them still survived at the end of Elizabeth's reign, like the veterans of the Crimea or the Mutiny in our own time.

This is no story of wholesale flights oversea, still less of thumb-screws and priests' holes. It is just that of a great company of Englishmen and Englishwomen, faced suddenly with a great crisis in their lives, setting to work, grumbling and growling, to make the best of a bad business, and to ensure their future by all the means available to them; the story, not of what ecclesiastical gladiators would have them to do, but of what the overwhelming majority of them did.¹

One of the most far-reaching effects of the Dissolution was the passage into private hands of the rights of presentation to churches of which the monasteries had possessed the advowson. At the time some of the monks had the benefit of these rights; as the century passed, new generations of clergy were provided by the new patrons. The survival and extension of the private advowson gave an independence to the parish clergy during the

¹ G. Baskerville, 'The Dispossessed Religious after the Suppression of the Monasteries', in *Essays in History presented to Reginald Lane Poole* (Oxford, 1927), p. 465. In the preceding account I have depended very much on this admirable paper, and on the work of A. Savine, 'English Monasteries on the eve of the Dissolution', in the *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History*, 1 (1909).

changes of opinion in ecclesiastical and theological matters which should not be overlooked. A Puritan patron would tend to appoint a Puritan vicar. A country squire would not think first of episcopal wishes or policy. The relations between the laity and the clergy were strengthened and the prospects of uniformity in clerical opinion diminished by the transference of property from the religious houses to the gentry.

The real tragedy in the story of the Dissolution must be sought, not in any dramatic conflict between the powers of good and evil, but in the very perplexities which assailed the monastic population. Hidden away among the indifferent were the troubled, and among the troubled were the saints and idealists and the few men of iron will. These were the true sufferers, whether they sought for a compromise which they could not find, or stood out firmly for Papal Supremacy and a united church, and above all, for the ideal of the religious life, the life of men who dedicate themselves to prayer for sinful and suffering mankind. These men, who were hanged at Tyburn or at their abbey gates, were the martyrs, for they felt about the monastic rule as Sir Thomas More felt. At the very least they could not conceal, in a chattering and malicious world, the faith that was in them. Some, like the brave Carthusians, were heroic men, others, like the unhappy Abbot Hobbes of Woburn, were weak men.¹ 'Brethren, this is a parlous time. Such a scourge was never heard sith Christ's Passion.' But if all had felt as they did, the Pilgrimage of Grace would have been a national, an irresistible movement. As things were, the greater monasteries followed the lesser or were transferred into secular cathedrals.

III. FROM THE LEGISLATION OF HENRY VIII TO THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI

The secularization of the extensive properties of the monasteries and the creation of a government office to administer the disposal of them raised the question of the rights of property as against the right of the State. By giving a nip to the abbeys,

¹ See the very moving story of Abbot Hobbes in Gardner, *Lollardy and the Reformation*, II. 133-40.

Henry did a great deal to set men's minds towards the theory of the State as a sovereign power, rather than as a self-directed organism held together by a common regard for customary rights and obligations. Most good men were in agreement upon the moral issue. They regretted the loss of the opportunity to convert ecclesiastical property to religious uses, which in their eyes included social and educational uses, although most monastic property was, of course, essentially secular in character and always subject in England to the common law. Latimer, as is well known, held this view, and Cranmer in the end of Edward VI's reign resisted the wanton spoliation of the Church. But by this time the greed of Northumberland and his satellites was but part of a policy which would have destroyed the traditional status of the Church of England and might well have involved its ultimate reconstruction on a non-episcopal basis, as abhorrent to Ridley and Cranmer as it was to Gardiner and Bonner. Cranmer, although he voted with most of the other bishops against the confiscation of the chantries and colleges in 1547, did not share the view of the Cambridge divine, Miles Wilson, that the seizure of ecclesiastical property was impious.¹ One of the articles of the rebels of Devon in 1549 asked for the restoration of the half part of the abbey lands and chantry land in every man's possession, however he came by them, 'to be given again to two places, where two of the chief abbeys were within every county; where such half part shall be taken out, and there to be established a place for devout persons, which shall pray for the King and the Commonwealth'. In his reply to the articles Cranmer dealt very firmly with this suggestion:

At the beginning you pretended that you meant nothing against the King's Majesty, but now you open yourselves plainly to the world that you go about to pluck the crown from his head, and, against all justice and equity, not only to take from him such lands as be annexed unto his crown, and be parcel of the same, but also against all right and reason to take from all other men such lands

¹ Wilson reduced the arguments of his Cambridge oration *De rebus ecclesiae non diripientis* to the form of a syllogistic summary and sent it by request to his acquaintance, William Cecil, at that time already one of the secretaries of State, in 1552, this is printed in Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer* (edited 1854), in 651-9.

as they came to by most just title, by gift, by sale, by exchange, or otherwise. There is no respect nor difference had amongst you, whether they came to them by right or by wrong. Be you so blind that you cannot see how justly you proceed to take the sword into your hands against your prince, and to dispossess just inheritors without any cause? Christ would not take upon him to judge the right and title of lands between two brethren, and you arrogantly presume not only to judge, but unjustly to take away all men's right titles, yea, even from the King himself.

Now, when he spoke of right titles, the archbishop was obviously referring to the rights given or covered by the King in Parliament. It was not for the rebels to question the fact, when the fact had legal sanction. And this brings us to a much wider issue than that of the right to the abbey lands. Was this breach with the past characteristic of the Reformation settlement in England as a whole? Or, to put the point in a different way, was the reorganization of the Church by Parliament regarded as inconsistent with the maintenance of its continuity? Did it substitute for a divine right the rights implied in a secular sanction? We can most profitably study the history of the Reformation with this issue in our minds. We are not concerned with the reflections of later ecclesiastics and theologians upon it, but with the facts, and, an essential element among the facts, the views of the chief actors in the movement about what they were doing or trying to do or preventing others from doing.

As is well known, formal continuity was maintained in England to a degree without parallel in any other reformed country with the exception of Sweden. Episcopal government, the assembly of the clergy in convocations and synods, the general diocesan system, the method of exercising discipline, and for twenty years the rites and ceremonies which had developed in the past to give expression to the doctrine of the Church, all these were retained. Moreover, until the latter part of Edward VI's reign, and in spite of acute differences of opinion, ecclesiastical life in England presented a picture of unity. This was doubtless due very largely to the strong personality of Henry the VIII, but Henry was helped by opinion. There were no Catholic

recusants, no Protestant dissenters. A few died as traitors because they denied the royal supremacy, a few more were burned as heretics because they rejected some of the dogmas or teaching of the Catholic Church. During all the changes effected before the second Act of Uniformity of 1552 there were very few people who were indifferent to the maintenance of the existing order. Thomas Cromwell was probably the only exception among persons of influence, and it is significant that he was attainted as a 'detestable heretic' as well as a traitor. When it was seen that the spread of foreign opinions and the public discussions about the Mass were producing a state of ferment in which violence and blasphemy could find free expression, there was a general revulsion of feeling. Protestant bishops, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and such advanced reformers as Bradford and Knox were alarmed. Queen Mary had the benefit of the reaction. This conservatism was rooted in an instinct of self-preservation; it was the natural result of the confusion in which medieval compromising and the peculiar conditions of English life had left the relations between Church and State. Englishmen were ready to do without the Pope, but were prepared for nothing else. Nobody in those days had any clear-cut theory of what the English Church was; indeed, it is hardly too much to say that nobody with the exception of Cranmer was sure what the 'Church of England' was. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was haphazard and chaotic, and Cranmer tried in vain to get recognition of a definite system of ecclesiastical law. The precise share of Convocation in the deliberations which preceded the chief measures of this time, for example the first Act of Uniformity and the official publication of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, is one of the most debatable problems in the history of the Reformation. Here lies the chief difference between the developments in the reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI and the settlement under Queen Elizabeth. During Elizabeth's reign the system of ecclesiastical administration, although it left much room for royal and parliamentary intervention, was at least coherent. The English Church found its apologists and exponents in Parker, Jewel, Hooker, Whitgift,

and Bancroft On the other hand, religious life in England was anything but united. Opposition came not from a few heretics but from groups of men, mainly within the Church, who preferred an entirely different system and cared nothing for continuity And the second breach with Rome forced an issue, as clear-cut as it had been blurred in King Henry's time, between the Roman and the English views of the Church The events of Queen Mary's reign had made this inevitable

We must first deal with the earlier period, which culminated in the disputes about the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI

The Reformation in England was a parliamentary transaction All the important changes were made under statutes, and the actions of the King as supreme head of the Church were done under a title and in virtue of powers given to him by statute Disciplinary action was administered, whether by the civil courts, special commissions, or the ecclesiastical authorities, according to rules laid down in statutes or in virtue of authority allowed by the King in Parliament. As a general rule proposed changes were first submitted to Convocation or to a group of advisers, who were sometimes a mixed body of ecclesiastics and laymen, sometimes ecclesiastics alone; but any preliminary discussions or decisions of Convocation or advisers required parliamentary sanction or royal approval The bishops continued to issue injunctions and articles of visitation, but any general action, even if it were concerned with doctrinal change or ritual, required secular sanctions If the leaders or synods of the Church had attempted any changes without such sanctions they would have been liable to proceedings involving the pains and penalty of *praemunire*, that 'purely English word', as the Milanese ambassador amusingly described it.¹ They would have

¹ In 1530, see Pollard, *Wolsey*, p 249 The word was originally simply a form of forewarning in a writ of procedure, beginning *praemunire facias* The forewarning 'supplied a new name for the statute out of which it had grown', the statute of 1353 (E. B. Graves in *Haskins Anniversary Essays*, p 75). The so-called great statute of *Praemunire* (1393) was an application of this procedure against offenders who sought process in the Court of Rome or elsewhere in particular kinds of cases which, as was admitted by the clergy, affected the royal jurisdiction In course of time this statute was interpreted to cover all recourse to any jurisdiction infringing on that of the crown See W. T. Waugh in the *English Historical Review*, xxxvii (1922),

acted upon or acknowledged an alien jurisdiction in matters affecting the interests of the crown and kingdom. Hence came the reluctance of the bishops to move a step unless they could carry the secular authorities with them and have legal protection for everything that they did. Nobody felt the necessity of this more strongly than that very typical Englishman, Stephen Gardiner; and nobody rejoiced in it more than Thomas Cranmer.

Obviously the first step was to secure recognition of the royal supremacy, for this would *ipso facto* rule out any debate or dispute about the limits to the legal intervention by the courts with a view to preventing the exercise in England of Papal or any other ecclesiastical jurisdiction. During the negotiations with Pope Clement VII about the divorce, Stephen Gardiner, one of the royal envoys, had threatened the Pope. At Ovieto, on the Friday before Palm Sunday, 1528, Gardiner, after a hot discussion, desired the Cardinals to note and ponder such words as he should say 'of duty and obedience towards the See Apostolic'. The Kings and nobles of England might well come to consider that Papal laws which were not clear to the Pope himself nor to his advisers might well be given to the flames. The failure to reach a conclusion in the following year when Wolsey and Campeggio sat as Papal commissioners in England, brought the question to a head. The great cardinal fell, and died on the 29th November 1530. A few days after Wolsey's death the Attorney-General filed an injunction in the Court of King's Bench against the whole body of the clergy. They had recognized the legatine authority of the cardinal and had come within the scope of praemunire. Parliament and Convocation were sitting, and the latter was made to understand that the clergy could make their peace with the King if they would recognize him to be the sole protector and supreme head of the Church in England. The Upper House debated for three days,

173-205, and Pollard's *Wolsey*. Wolsey, Mr. Pollard observes, was an adept in its use, but was indicted under it. The most powerful impeachment of Papal jurisdiction in England was condemned 'by a simple and almost routine process in the court of King's Bench'. That the King had personally aided and abetted his jurisdiction did not legally help him.

under the presidency of the archbishop. Finally it silently concurred in the new title 'as far as the law of Christ allows'. The Convocation of the northern province followed suit. This declaration had as yet no clear legal effect. Although the King was already playing with the view that the headship of the Pope had no scriptural or historical validity, and there was much talk about the matter, Henry had no immediate intention of breaking with Rome. He was declared to be head of the Church in England, not of a separate church, but the way was prepared for a further submission of the clergy, and for the first statutory action against Papal rights.

In 1532 Parliament entered on the scene. It is customary to say that Henry VIII's parliaments were entirely subservient to him, a statement which is due in great measure to a misunderstanding of the nature of this assembly in the early sixteenth century. Then, as in the later Middle Ages, it was the highest expression of the King's court. Its legislative enactments had supreme validity, although even a century later the view was still held by the common lawyers that a statute was not invariably to be regarded as binding upon the courts of law. It was the source of taxation. On the other hand, it was not essential to government, it had no privileges except those which attached to its members as men called to serve the Crown, and its business was prepared for and presented to it by the King's ministers. The elected element known as the Commons, who deliberated separately, was closely bound up with the aristocratic society of the shires. Parliament was a gathering for special purposes, to express the common consent of King and people, to ventilate grievances and provide the means of government. Latimer, in one of his sermons, likens it to the day of the second coming of Christ.

This day will be like unto a parliament. Ye know, when things are amiss in a realm, or out of order, all they that be good-hearted, that love godliness, they wish for a parliament, these would fain have that all the rulers of the realm should come together, and bring all things in good order again. For ye know that parliaments are kept only for this purpose, that things which be amiss may be amended.

Hence, if we are to consider the subserviency of Parliament, we must put our modern conceptions on one side. As a matter of fact, Henry, by carrying Parliament with him at every step, during a critical period in our history, gave it a more important place in the commonwealth than it had previously possessed. The very fact that he could not do without it, that no man, however despotic in temper, could afford to break with Rome and reduce the clergy to subjection apart from it, is a tribute to its importance. If there was grumbling and hot speech in the Commons, then a wise king would be very wary, for these people did not readily incur the royal displeasure. A wise king would not act as though there were any necessary cleavage between him and his people, and there is enough evidence to show that the statutes of the reign were not passed without careful debate, and that the King's wishes were not always complied with. Henry managed his parliaments, but he realized the truth of the words spoken by Sir Thomas More as Speaker of the Commons in 1523, that many who are boisterous and rude in language are deep, and he assumed the good faith of the petition that he should interpret every man's words as 'proceeding out of a good zeal towards the profit of your realm and honour of your royal person'. He made heavy calls upon Parliament and knew, as was said during a period of strain in 1531, that his strength lay in the affection of his people.

Wolsey's old servant Thomas Cromwell was sworn a member of the Council in 1530 and was rapidly rising in the royal favour. It was possibly he who saw that the best way to shake the clergy was to array the laity against them. The old Archbishop Warham had already repented of his acquiescence in the royal demands of 1530, and in February 1532 issued a solemn protest which shows something of the spirit of Becket and Grossctcsc. It was not difficult to bring anti-clerical feeling to a head. Feeling of this kind was not prevalent in everyday life, but it was easily stirred against the harassing discipline and petty exactions of the Church, and was responsive to mass appeals against ecclesiastical abuses. In 1487 Convocation had included among the matters which required reform the denunciatory sermons of

preachers at St Paul's Cross who would attack the Church, that is to say, its abuses, in the absence of clergy but in the presence of laymen 'qui semper clericis sunt infesti'. In Henry VIII's early years, when excitement about religious matters was still more prevalent, especially in London and other centres of population, ecclesiastical jurisdiction had met with violent criticism. This was very evident in the notorious case of Richard Hunne in 1514. Again, Englishmen, however orthodox, were not uninfluenced by the secular tendencies in continental politics, notably in Germany. As the King's own actions showed, the advantages of secular control would become accepted as a matter of course; the question was in the air. This was the teaching of Tindale, whose books were circulated widely in secret. In 1529 the pamphleteer Simon Fish, and in 1532 a much more respectable person, the lawyer Christopher St Germain, made it an issue of open debate. St Germain, in his *Treatise concerning the division between the Spirituality and the Temporality*, while appearing to deplore the situation, drew an extravagant picture of society divided into two hostile camps, and called for the abolition of clerical privileges as harmful to the community. His methods of controversy aroused Sir Thomas More, always an apostle of the natural harmony of society, to protest in hot indignation. All the prevalent movements of thought and feeling are focused with great skill in the petition of the Commons presented to the King in March 1532 and sent on by him to Convocation for reply. Henry adopted an attitude of impartial detachment, but while there is no reason to doubt that the petition expressed the mind of the Commons, it was certainly prepared in the Court. Four corrected drafts of it survive, carefully corrected, and most of the corrections are in the hand of Thomas Cromwell. The rapid growth of fantastical and erroneous opinions, and the dangers of discord and debate provoked by the extreme and uncharitable behaviour of certain ordinaries (or ecclesiastical authorities), is given as the occasion of the protest. The people are described as subject to ordinances of Convocation, made without royal consent, and hidden away in a language which they cannot understand. They are

pictured as distracted by vexatious delays, exactions, and interference, and caught in a mesh of unintelligible subtleties and simoniacal practices. Even those accused of heresy have no chance, attacked without good reason, exposed to public contempt if they escape, or, as 'some simple silly soul precisely standing to the clear testimony of his own well-known conscience, rather than to confess his innocent truth', utterly destroyed. The moral is drawn that disturbance or unrest cannot be checked by the pedantic and harsh entanglements of spiritual discipline. The King should provide redress and reform, for he is 'the only head, sovereign lord, protector, and defender of both the said parties'

This first demonstration of the laity in Parliament is very significant. It is a skilful appeal to very natural human feeling, always more powerful than the weighty assertion of political doctrine. It assumes that the value of an expedient use of the secular authority far outweighs in importance the maintenance of the traditional co-operation of Church and State. The reply was dignified and able, but it had no effect, and was the first and last attempt by an independent Convocation to urge the necessity under changing conditions of maintaining the conception of an organic and self-controlled ecclesiastical system, a system acting with that of the secular authority. It was drawn up by the new bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, the ablest canonist of his time. Gardiner, who like Cromwell had been in Wolsey's service, had become the King's Secretary and his chief adviser. He had, as we have seen, been ardent in promoting the royal divorce and had warned the Pope that vacillation might involve the repudiation by England of Papal laws. His promotion to the great see of Winchester at the end of 1531 might well have been a step to Canterbury. Whether or not he was ignorant of the origin of the Commons' petition is not known, but now he had no hesitation in showing that his view of the future was very different from Cromwell's. Gardiner was by temperament and training a constitutionalist. He regarded the maintenance of legal forms as essential to the life and well-being of society, whether in Church or State, and had no belief in arbitrary

opportunism. In the reply which he drafted for Convocation he came at once to the crucial issue. All the detailed objections made by the Commons were argued, but they were subsidiary and could be met by simple measures of reform. The essential thing was to maintain the co-operation of the two powers, 'a most sure and perfect conjunction and agreement, as God being *lapis angularis* to agree and conjoin the same'. Let each power temper its own laws with a view to mutual understanding; but the authority of Convocation was grounded upon the Scripture of God and the determination of Holy Church. Its members had a charge and duty entrusted to them by God, and could not submit their execution to the King's assent. Gardiner is often regarded as a hypocrite and time-server, but he was nothing of the sort. Although complete severance from Rome was not yet contemplated by the clergy, and probably was not desired by Henry himself, Gardiner saw no inconsistency between his traditional view of ecclesiastical independence and the acknowledgement of the royal supremacy. He had to give in, but, after he had accepted the logical result of royal supremacy, he stood none the less for the constitutional view of development and for the retention of the old order and the old doctrine in a Church under the control of King and Parliament. But we must return to him later.

In May of this year, 1532, Convocation submitted. Relying on the King's religious zeal and great learning, the clergy promised that they would promulgate or execute no ordinance unless by royal consent. They begged him to appoint a commission of thirty-two persons, of whom sixteen should be clergy and sixteen 'of the upper and nether house of the temporality', to revise existing constitutions and to bring them into accord with God's law and the laws of the realm.

The final step was delayed for two years. In 1532 Henry was still troubled about the divorce. He had to give up all hope of Papal action in his favour and was threatened with excommunication if he married again, yet if he broke too violently or suddenly with Rome, he might not be able to rely upon the acquiescence of his people. Disturbance at home would mean

serious danger from abroad At this juncture he was able to enlist a new recruit, more cautious, sincere, and respectable than the invaluable Cromwell This was Thomas Cranmer, who in his fortieth year (1529) had risen with unusual rapidity into prominence The son of a country gentleman in Nottinghamshire, bred in country sports and an intrepid horseman, Cranmer had gone to Cambridge After an early but brief marriage he was left a widower He devoted himself to theology, and when he came under the King's notice was one of the leading theologians in the University The story goes that he owed his promotion to a chance conversation with Gardiner, the King's secretary, and Fox, the King's almoner, whom he met at a friend's house in Essex Talk turned upon the divorce and Cranmer expressed the view that the matter should be regarded as a theological question Gardiner and Fox reported their conversation to the King, who sent for Cranmer and was so impressed by him that he kept him near him, making him an inmate of the household of Anne Boleyn's father, Sir Thomas Boleyn, recently created Earl of Wiltshire and Ormonde A new and more hopeful way was opened to Henry Cranmer was a convinced student of the Scriptures, not as the historical and traditional so much as the living basis and criterion of theological truth. The range of his learning and the vigour of his teaching had given him influence in Cambridge, and now through his efforts theological opinion in the University veered round from a hostile to a friendly view of Henry's case. The divorce was to be founded in the divine law, enforced by Scripture, that a man could not marry his brother's wife Cranmer became essential to the King He strengthened the royal purpose when it was shaken by the arguments of Henry's brilliant young kinsman, Reginald Pole¹ He took a wider and firmer view than that of the canonist pleader, Gardiner, and was a more resolute supporter of secular authority. It is curious to think that he came to power through the chance notice of his

¹ The only evidence about Pole's views at this time is in a letter from Cranmer to Wiltshire, probably written in 1531, but it seems a fair conjecture that the criticisms of Cranmer were known to and influenced the King

future rival and that one of his earliest services to the King was the refutation of a young nobleman who, as Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury, was later to triumph by his death

In 1530 and 1532 Cranmer was employed as Henry's representative first at Rome and in 1532 at the imperial court in Germany he made the acquaintance of some of the reformers, including Osiander of Nuremberg, whose niece he married. His marriage was, of course, invalid by the law of the Church to which he still belonged, and in the English Church until 1548 it involved him in much difficulty and opprobrium, and was a private arrangement which is a tribute to the independence of his conscience rather than to his wisdom. It may also be regarded as a proof that he had no expectations of the greatness which was in store for him. On the death of Warham the King passed over Gardiner and all the other bishops in favour of Cranmer. The offer of the archbishopric put him in a difficulty. He did not accept Papal supremacy, yet Henry was not prepared to appoint an archbishop outright against the law of the Church. Such a step would have been most impolitic until the Church of England had been definitely constituted, and yet the King required an archbishop on whom he could rely in order to carry through the change. All that had been done so far had been done within the kingdom and with the consent of Convocation. Parliamentary action had been confined to the Act of Annates, an Act which was permissive and by its own provisions was left to the King as an instrument for negotiation with the Papal Curia during the summer and winter of 1532. England was still in communion with Rome, and its primate had to be canonically elected by the monastic chapter at Canterbury, approved by the Pope, and consecrated with the sanction of Papal bulls and with a sworn promise of obedience to the Papal see. Hence both the Pope and Cranmer had to be managed. The Pope was first asked to believe that the King had done all that he could to resist the importunities of his people in their attack upon the Papal revenues; later he was given to understand that unless the bulls confirming Cranmer's election were issued, the act abolishing annates and first fruits would be

enforced. At this time the distance between England and the Papal Court helped Henry rather than the Pope, the bulls were issued at Bologna, 22nd February 1533. Henry had secretly married Anne Boleyn in January; the great Act in Restraint of Appeals was debated and passed in February, the bulls arrived in March. Cranmer was consecrated on the 30th, and under his presidency in Convocation the next day the clergy, Bishop Fisher and a few others alone resisting, adopted his view and the verdict of the universities that the King's first marriage was contrary to the Divine law. Shortly afterwards Queen Catherine was declared to be divorced, after a tedious and pedantic process which the new archbishop conducted at the priory of Dunstable.

Cranmer's reluctance to take the oath to the Pope was overcome by the casuistry of a convenient canonist. He might take it under protest. His protestation accordingly may be found entered in his register, with the bulls authorizing his consecration and his oath to Pope Clement VII. The oath, he declared, had no force in so far as it bound him to do anything contrary to the law of God, to the King or his realm, laws and prerogatives, nor did it impede him from taking his share in the reformation of the English Church.¹ This action was never forgiven him. Twenty years later Cardinal Pole set it beside his eucharistic heresies as the most scandalous blot in his heretical life. Whether Cranmer, holding the views which he held and conscious as he was of his ability to forward them, should have withdrawn into private life is a moral issue which could be debated for ever. He made his position perfectly clear. Several

¹ The most important clauses of the oath and accompanying protestation ran as follows

The Oath

Papatum Romanum et regalia S Petri adiutor er ero, ad retinendum et defendendum, salvo meo ordine, contra omnem hominem

The Protestation

Cum iuramentum praestari me, ante meam consecrationem, aut tempore eiusdem, pro forma potius quam pro esse aut re obligatoria ad illam obtinendam oporteat, non est nec erit meae voluntatis aut intentionis per huiusmodi iuramentum me obligare ad aliquod ratione eorundem posthac dicendum faciendum aut attemptandum quod erit aut esse videbitur contra legem Dei, vel contra regem nostrum Angliae, aut rempublicam huius sui regni Anghiae, legesve aut praerogativas eiusdem

months before, the King had called the attention of Parliament to the latent contradiction between the oaths of obedience to the Pope and to himself. In his new role as head of the Church he regarded the bishops as only half his subjects, just as King John had regarded the men who, more than three hundred years before, had wished to do homage to the French king for their Norman lands as well as to remain his men for their English lands. Once Cranmer was consecrated and generally accepted, once Convocation had given the sanction of the clergy to his divorce and second marriage, he could go forward. So in the spring session of the next year, 1534, Parliament gave statutory ratification to all that had been done and pushed it to its logical conclusion. Hitherto the chief instrument had been Convocation. Convocation had given the King his title, surrendered its right to independent legislation and, in the name of the Divine law, had withdrawn the matrimonial difficulties of the King from Papal cognizance. But the original impetus was given by the petition of the Commons, a petition which the King had professed to regard as a free and independent expression of the general will. Henceforward Convocation took the second place and the King in Parliament gave a legal character to a national church.

The legislation of 1534 was an application, to all the issues involved, of the political doctrine which was expanded in the famous Act of February 1533 in restraint of appeals. It is known that this Act was not passed without discussion. In the Commons the opposition was inspired mainly by fear of the consequences, but hesitation there was, which Cromwell's arts of management were required to allay. The fear of schism was certainly natural, for the grounds of the Act are found in political history. Recognition is given to the corporate identity of the spirituality 'now being usually called the English Church' (a curious limitation of the church to the clergy, which reminds us that we are reading Cromwell rather than Cranmer), and the upper house of Convocation is made the final court of appeal in ecclesiastical cases which touch the King. In the beginning of 1533 Convocation had still to express the mind of the clergy on

the divorce. But the Act allows no independent standing to the Church, and in the next year Convocation ceased to have any appellate jurisdiction. The clergy are required to fulfil their sacred functions notwithstanding any Papal prohibition. If any spiritual person should refuse to do so, he is liable to a year's imprisonment, if he procures or allocates or abets in any way a Papal mandate he is liable to all the pains and penalties of *praemunire*. In other words the duty of a priest to administer the Sacraments was to be a civil as well as a spiritual duty; non-performance was made an offence under an Act of Parliament. It is worth while to set out the historical theory of the preamble of this Act.

Where by divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this realm of England is an empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and king, having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same, unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms, and by names of spirituality and temporality, be bounden and ought to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience: he being also institute and furnished, by the goodness and sufferance of Almighty God, with plenary whole and entire power, pre-eminence, authority, prerogative and jurisdiction, to render and yield justice, and final determination to all manner of folk residents or subjects within this his realm, in all causes within the limits thereof, without restraint or provocation to any foreign princes or potentates of the world, the body spiritual whereof having power, when any cause of the law divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted and showed by that part of the said body politic, called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, &c.

The organic theory of the independent State, which I think was very probably taken from Marsilio of Padua,¹ is given

¹ Cf. *Defensor Pacis*, I. xvii, II. vi. Marsilio's famous work was first printed at Basel in 1522 and an English translation by William Marshall was published in 1535. Marshall was a protégé of Anne Boleyn's and one of Cromwell's confidential agents. His translations were made under Cromwell's patronage, and it is most unlikely that Cromwell had not studied Marsilio before the English translation appeared. The *Defensorum Pacis*, as it was styled, appears on the list of prohibited books in 1542 printed in Burnet. The people are said to have greatly murmured at it, and it did not sell. (See Professor Pollard's life of Marshall in the *D N B*.)

an historical setting. The reformation was to be regarded as a return to the past, a vindication of the rights of the crown against usurped jurisdiction. But there is no suggestion, such as was worked out by later apologists and theologians, of a primitive independent Church in England. The Church is the clergy, and the function of the church is to declare the divine law, nothing is said of the execution of it. The English Church has not yet succeeded in extricating itself from this conception of its character. In February 1533 it would have been unwise to draw the logical conclusion and to give to the body politic as a whole, in the person of the King, the ultimate voice in the interpretation and execution of the law of God. The Spirituality was required to declare it a few weeks later in the matter of the King's marriage. But this logical conclusion was foreshadowed in the preamble of the Act, and was not long delayed.

The Papal reply to the proceedings in England in the spring of 1533 was the preparation of bulls of excommunication. Henry in November lodged an appeal to a General Council, an appeal which with the statute in restraint of appeals was fastened to every church door in England. The country in 1533 and the following year was put under careful surveillance and royal proclamations, episcopal injunctions, the efforts of preachers enforced the duty of repudiating the bishop of Rome. The centre of activity was parliament in its eventful session during the first three months of 1534. In December 1533 the King's Council had been hard at work. The imperial ambassador reported it met almost daily 'and several learned canonists are summoned to the board'. The result was the carefully worded and drastic legislation which gave statutory definition to all that had been done. The submission of the clergy, the superiority of the Crown to Convocation, the right of the King to nominate bishops for election and, failing election, to appoint by letters patent, the royal ratification of the Act restraining the payment of annates and first-fruits, were all given parliamentary sanction. One important change was made: appeals from the archbishop's courts were to go, not to the upper House of Convocation but to Chancery, and every one had this right of appeal:

Upon every such appeal, a commission shall be directed under the great seal to such persons as shall be named by the King's highness, his heirs or successors, *like as in case of appeal from the admiral's court*, to hear and definitely determine such appeals, and the causes concerning the same

Another important Act dealt with dispensations. The Papal power of dispensation, which had developed rapidly since the twelfth century in virtue of the *plenitudo potestatis*, had been essential to ecclesiastical administration and to the maintenance of harmonious relations between the various parts of the Church, and between the secular and spiritual powers. It was an ever-springing fount of oil playing upon the ecclesiastical machinery. If a bastard desired to take holy orders, or a clerk to hold more than one benefice with cure of souls, if any particular adjustment in the operation of the canon law were required, the remedy had lain directly or indirectly with the Holy See. The whole controversy regarding the King's divorce had turned first upon the technical procedure and later upon the limitations of the dispensing power. The Act of 1534, which handed over all this jurisdiction to the archbishop of Canterbury, expressed in general terms the distinction recently emphasized by Convocation between human law and the law of God. All human law was subject to dispensation, but dispensation cannot apply to causes (and here Cranmer adopted a more rigid definition than did the canonists) contrary or repugnant to the Holy Scriptures and laws of God. There was no intention to 'decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in any things concerning the very articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom or in any other things declared by Holy Scripture and the Word of God,' necessary for salvation. But, with this qualification, dispensation from law within the realm was under the full power and authority of the King and the lords and commons representing the whole State of the realm. There was no law, whatever its origin, not so subject to dispensation. The canon law was not foreign law, but law of foreign origin, accepted, with royal sufferance, by the people as their own. The archbishop was constrained to dispense, not in virtue of any

power vested in him as archbishop, but by the King and Parliament. His power extended to such instruments as had previously been obtained from Rome, and if he did not exercise it the King might order the issue of appropriate writs in Chancery. Here we have a clear application of the doctrine of the unity of the State, and of its independence. Here again there is no suggestion of the way in which the sacred law of God could be enforced apart from the secular authority.

Next came the first Act of Succession, the Act under which More and Fisher died. It set the seal of Parliament on the divorce and the rights of the little princess Elizabeth. It declares even more emphatically than the other statutes of the period that no man, of what estate, degree or condition soever he may be, has power to dispense with God's law, and it cites in confirmation the judgement of Convocation, the universities, and the archbishop. The succession was a domestic matter, and certainty was essential, for in the past uncertainty had not only carried confusion, it had also given an opening to the Bishop of Rome, 'contrary to the great and inviolable grants of jurisdiction given by God immediately to emperors, kings, and princes'. More and Fisher would have acquiesced in this Act if it had gone no farther. But the succession involved an oath of obedience, it was the core of the whole revolution, for the rights of the infant princess rested upon the repudiation of all alien jurisdictions. Every subject of full age was to swear to defend to the full extent of his powers the whole effects and contents of the Act.¹ The nation was to form itself, so to speak, into a sworn commune to establish the new settlement. Refusal to take the oath was to be an act of treason.

Although so much had been said about the royal prerogative, Parliament had not yet formally confirmed the position of the King. It crowned its labours in November of this year 1534 by passing the Supremacy Act (26 Henry VIII, c. 1). The title of supreme head on earth, recognized by Convocation in 1530,

¹ No definite oath was prescribed in the Act, but a form was devised on the day of the prorogation and incorporated in the second Act of Succession in November. The certificate of the commissioners who administered the oath was made 'as strong and available in the law' as an indictment by a local grand jury.

was enacted by authority of Parliament. Thus the first step in the revolution was also the last, but with three significant differences. The law of the realm rounded off what a declaratory confession of the clergy had begun. The saving clause 'so far as the law of God allows' was omitted. And, in the third place, the scope of the royal power was defined as 'power and authority from time to time to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they be which by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed,' &c. The King has a spiritual jurisdiction. His Vicar-General could, in virtue of this statement, preside in Convocation. His visitors could supersede episcopal authority, just as in the old days a great eyre superseded all other administration of justice. His injunctions had the validity of ecclesiastical acts. The King in Parliament could define the true faith, so that proceedings in cases of heresy might take place under statutory commissions or even by process of common law in the secular courts, as well as in the ecclesiastical tribunals. In the face of these facts how is it possible to describe the reformation under Henry VIII as the organization of an independent national Church under royal protection? How is it possible to deny that the rejection of Papal authority, far more than the national wars of the later Middle Ages, gave reality to the conception of a united sovereign State, in which the King in Parliament expresses the national will, and this in matters ecclesiastical no less than in civic affairs?

It may be well at this point to examine the considerations which can be urged in modification of these conclusions. The first, and a fundamental, objection might be raised that, as Scripture, in the eyes of the Reformers the main source of the divine law, was so frequently pleaded in justification of the changes in England, a serious limitation was imposed from the outset upon the authority of the King in Parliament. As the Act in restraint of appeals alleged, the spirituality were the exponents of this divine law, and must have been regarded as possessed of independent authority to expound it. In the words

of Bishop Burnet, the King had power 'to oversee and cause that the said Bishops and Priests do execute their pastoral office truly and faithfully, and especially in these points which by Christ and His Apostles were given and committed to them'. This argument is perfectly sound. No one denied that the law of God was far removed above all mundane interference; indeed, in the eyes of the Roman Church, the crime of the schism was increased by the blasphemous assumption that it was inspired by regard for the law of God as well as by regard for English traditions. Also, the right of interpretation was regarded, on theological and historical grounds, as lying in the clergy and not in the laity. The Elizabethan bishops were to find themselves faced by a clamorous regard for the law of God, which Puritans and Separatists declared to be quite inconsistent with the English settlement, and they doubtless resisted the clamour as schismatical no less than as a piece of civil disobedience. On the other hand, it would be hard to find evidence in the sixteenth century, though there is plenty in the seventeenth, that the English Church was regarded as an independent shrine of the divine law, as a society which, in obedience to its own being and responsibilities, had the right to maintain itself against the State. Even Hooker, who did not deny that 'a church as such and a commonwealth as such are distinguishable things'¹, denied that, as applied to England, there was any force in the distinction. The very nature of the revolution in Henry VIII's reign had made a position like this impossible. The watchwords of conservatives and reformers alike were unity and obedience. The duty to maintain the law of God was, so to speak, distributed, or in times of trouble, concentrated in the King. Mistakes might be made, but conscience might be a treacherous guide, and it was better to endure than to endanger unity. In other words, the attitude at its best was very like the attitude of the great men, More, Contarini, Pole, and the rest, who regarded the unity of the Church as the all-important thing, but in England the unity of the realm took the place of the united Church in the regard of men. The general view was

* The words are Mr J W Allen's

doubtless less refined. The shadow of *praemunire* lay darkly over the clergy. The generation which had responsibility in ecclesiastical affairs after 1532—and changes in the episcopate were numerous in these years—depended upon the Crown. They wished for nothing less than to be left exposed to the blasts of public criticism. For it must not be supposed that the distinction between positive and divine law, so clear to bishops and canonists, was apparent to or accepted by all. The great laity had no intention of allowing an independent status to the clerical order. The pains and penalties of *praemunire* struck at those who exercised jurisdiction contrary to the law of the land, and in the eyes of lawyers and nobles were an effective safeguard against prelates who guided a complacent monarch as well as against those who resisted a strong one. ‘Thou art a good fellow, Bishop,’ said Audley the Chancellor to Gardiner, ‘look at the Act of Supremacy, and there the King’s doings be restrained to spiritual jurisdiction; and in another Act it is provided that no spiritual law shall have place contrary to the Common Law or Act of Parliament.’¹ And this were not so, you bishops would enter in with the King, and by means of this supremacy order the laity as he listed. Audley did not refer to the law of God when he spoke of spiritual laws, but in practice episcopal rule would have been based on the claim to administer as well as expound divine law, and the nobility would run no risks. Others went further still at this time. The lawyer Christopher St. Germain taught that it was for ‘the King’s grace and his Parliament’ to expound Scripture, and so decide what the irrefragable law of God is; for the King with his people have the authority of the Church. And if they make the Church, then they may expound Scripture. Indeed, since the Reformation, the sanction of the law of God has not, in general Anglican opinion, implied any peculiar privilege in the clergy nor any strong belief in an independent organization of the Church, nor any unity in the matter among the clergy themselves. In

¹ The Act confirming the submission of the clergy, 1534 (25 Henry VIII, c. 19). By spiritual law Audley meant constitutions of the clergy. His remark illustrates very well one of the reasons for giving parliamentary expression to the submission of Convocation in 1530 and 1532.

Henry's reign such views were quite impracticable. Certainly the King did not share them. He regarded himself as the protector of his creatures, the bishops and clergy, not as subject to their advice. This is how he spoke to Parliament in 1545.

If you know surely that a bishop or a preacher crieth or teacheth perverse doctrine, come and declare it to some of our Council or to us, to whom is committed by God in high authority to reform and order such causes and behaviour

'Committed by God' 'He that judgeth the King judgeth God,' Tindale had said. There was little danger that this view would hold in the land of the common law. And the rights of private conscience were to have a great future in England. But it is quite clear that for the ordinary man the distinction between different kinds of law was simply non-existent. He obeyed the law and believed what he was told. He was like John Dumbell, the vicar of Southcerney, who when he was asked during Bishop Hooper's Visitation in 1551, to repeat and prove from Scripture the Lord's Prayer, was able to repeat it, and knew it to be the Lord's Prayer *propterea quod tradita sit a Domini Rege, ac scripta in libro regio de Communi Oracione*¹

These considerations deprive a second argument in favour of the survival of a separately organized Church of most of its force. The spirituality, commonly known as the Church of England, to use the phraseology of the Act in Restraint of Appeals, had, it can be truly urged, a corporate existence in the provincial convocations which met at the same time as Parliament. There was no breach in the continuity of Convocation; it discussed ecclesiastical problems and granted taxes as of old; its legislation dealt with the doctrine, formularies, law, and discipline of the Church. After a study of the Acts of Convocation, accessible to him, though they were afterwards destroyed in the Great Fire of London, Peter Heylyn the biographer of Archbishop Laud, declared that 'there was but little done in King Henry's time, but that which was acted by the clergy only in their convocation, and so commanded to the people of the King's sole authority'. It may be granted (so the argument

¹ *English Historical Review*, xix (1904), 112.

would continue) that the activity in Convocation was not so independent and self-directed as the records would make it appear to have been. It was summoned in virtue of the King's writ, it could proceed to no legislative business without the royal licence, it could put none of its decrees into execution without the permission of the King under the great seal. All this is true; but in what respect was Parliament any better off? Have we not here two concurrent assemblies, representative of the spirituality and laity, expressions of the organic life of Church and State respectively?

There is some force in this argument. Formally, it is an accurate statement of the case. Yet it would be quite misleading to describe Convocation as an independent body, or to suggest that it had the life in it which we can see in the Houses of Parliament. As one follows in detail the history of the Reformation from 1534 until the important provincial synod of 1604, and especially until the death of Edward VI, one finds at every step the co-operation of laity and clergy, of royal councillors, lawyers, bishops, and theologians. The guidance of ecclesiastical affairs was a matter of State. An Act of Parliament gave validity to every important change, the Act of the Six Articles in Henry's reign, the two Prayer Books of Edward's reign. The King had the controlling interest in the formulation of articles in the one, the Council in the other reign. The bishops and officers of the Church were in fact the heads and executors of an administrative department of the State. So great was the sense of their inferiority that in 1547 the lower clergy petitioned that, in accordance with ancient practice (a short-lived practice of the fourteenth century), the lower House of Convocation might be adjoined and associated with the lower House of Parliament, or else that statutes concerning religion and causes ecclesiastical might not pass without their sight and assent. They also requested to see the books said to have been prepared by a royal commission in the late reign with regard to the services of the Church. Moreover, during this time Parliament began to give legal sanction to the financial grants of the clergy, which since the middle of the fourteenth century had been an independent act of Convocation. But the

most significant obstacle to the freedom of Convocation was the well-known fact that none of its decisions had any legal effect if they were contrary to the common law or Acts of Parliament. In 1620 Coke gave it as his opinion that the royal consent could not give validity to such decisions. We come back to the stand-point of Audley. Convocation was rather 'a collection of individuals deeply interested in the pending measures and well qualified to give advice respecting them, than an authority in any manner co-ordinate with the Crown',¹ or rather, with the King in Parliament.

It is from this point of view that we must consider the curious fact that the English Church has no code of law. Parliament in 1534 allowed continuous validity to the canon law and procedure in so far as it was not abrogated *ipso facto* by the statutes or contrary to the law of the land. Also, authorization was given for the appointment of a mixed commission of thirty-two persons who should have the duty to reduce the surviving law of the medieval Church into a system in harmony with the new settlement. Cranmer worked hard at this task from time to time, but although three statutes of Henry VIII dealt with the appointment of the commission, it was not until the end of Edward VI's reign that the work was done, and then by a smaller commission of eight persons, the archbishop and the bishop of Ely, two theologians (of whom the famous Peter Martyr was one), two civilians, and two common lawyers. Edward died before the *reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum* could be authorized. Archbishop Parker revised the material, and the work was ultimately published by John Foxe, the martyrologist, in 1571, in order to provide information for the House of Commons. But it was refused royal authority. Hence the law of the Church in addition to the statutes and the documents, including the Prayer Book, authorized by statute, consisted of the canons of Convocation, notably those of 1562, and a mass of rules and forms of proceedings which, in the course of time,

¹ Edward Cardwell, *Synodalia* (Oxford, 1842), p. x. In general, Cardwell's depreciation of the share of Convocation seems to go too far, and is not easily reconciled with his comments elsewhere on the importance of the Canons of 1562 and other transactions in Elizabeth's reign.

was gradually worn away to nothing by the encroachments of the secular law. The reluctance of the Crown to give effect to an ordered reformation of the law is very significant, and it is equally worthy of notice that the active interest in it, shown in Elizabeth's reign, came from a Puritan section. The Puritans were more concerned with the idea than with the contents of the book, for they were coming to feel the necessity of a self-ordered ecclesiastical system free from the joint management of bishops and privy councillors. But the general character of the Reformation in Henry's reign and the contemporary concern about the nature of law suggest considerations of wider interest. The study and practice of the canon law in the previous centuries had naturally had considerable influence upon the study and practice of the common law. There was an intimate connexion between the leading principles of law and theology, and as equitable jurisdiction developed in England in the Court of Chancery, the experience of the Church in the application of problems of reason and conscience was of much assistance to those who had to deal with 'hard cases' in the law. The very fact that the common law was the accepted law in England, powerful enough at this very time to resist the threatened invasion of the civil or Roman law, made it all the more important that the adjustment of the common law to claims of reason and conscience, whether in the common law courts or in the courts of equity, should be intelligently provided for. Hence the well-read lawyer who was interested in the bearing of legal developments was drawn to the study of the canon law. He found in the natural law of canonists and theologians the fundamental principles of all positive law, he appreciated the value of their experience in the reasonable construction or interpretation of existing custom, and he saw how equitable remedies depended in the last resort upon man's natural power 'of discerning between good and evil and of inclining towards the good', the power which is the sanction of conscience.¹ Now, if

¹ Vinogradoff, 'Reason and Conscience in Sixteenth-Century jurisprudence' (*Collected Papers*, II 193-8). This is a study of the most important work of Christopher St Germain, the dialogue between a doctor of divinity and a student of the laws of England.

we realize that the thinkers and jurists, who in the sixteenth century were expounding doctrines of the organic unity of the State under the guidance of the Crown, were actively aware of all this medieval experience, we see at once that they would find no difficulty in reconciling the spiritual and secular aspects of society in one united body politic. They were not atheists, they believed in the all-penetrating authority of 'natural law', the rules of reason and conscience, and they could not contemplate the possibility of a fundamental opposition between the law of God, which they could not touch, and the positive law of man. They were medieval enough not to believe in the secular State and modern enough to believe in the self-sufficiency of the State. The great work of Hooker was, in the main, a philosophical statement of their instinctive convictions. What was essential in the canonical system they had got; what was of every day use could be administered in the ecclesiastical courts. But they desired to see no rival to the common law.

The proceedings against heresy are an admirable example of the relations between the canon and the common law in the age of the Reformation. In medieval theory the secular power was the protector, the arm of the Church, and had a particular duty to assist the Church in the extirpation of heresy. The heretic was tried by the Church, but the secular authority was at hand to give aid in his detection and arrest, and had the duty of dealing with an obstinate heretic. In the words of Pope Boniface VIII, the Church handed over the offender for due punishment (*animadversio debita*). From the twelfth century the recognized penalty inflicted upon the obstinate and relapsed heretic was death by fire. In a famous constitution the Emperor Frederick II gave expression to this view, and in another he ordered the secular authorities in his Italian dominions to give aid to the Church, both constitutions were afterwards incorporated in another law which was given universal application throughout the empire and received yet wider authority from the explicit reference made to it by Boniface VIII in the decree already quoted, a decree which was included in

the Sext or sixth book of the decretals or codification of the canon law¹ When, for the first time, heresy became common in England at the end of the fourteenth century, this procedure was adopted There was some hesitating legislation in the reign of Richard II, but in the next reign (1401) Henry IV issued a writ ordering the execution of Sawtre, a Lollard condemned as a heretic by Convocation At the same time general effect was given to this procedure by an Act, the famous statute *De heretico comburendo*, which commanded the local sheriff or mayor to receive heretics condemned in an ecclesiastical court, and to burn them publicly in a prominent place A later act of 1414 (2 Henry V, st 1, c 7) emphasized still more the co-operation of the two powers The royal judges were authorized to make inquiry into heresy; the goods and chattels of the condemned were to go to the King, but again all the judicial proceedings must take place in the ecclesiastical courts. Moreover, it was enacted that the chancellor, treasurer, judges, and all officers of justice must take an oath on appointment to do their utmost to extirpate heresy by assisting the ordinaries and their commissaries So effect was given to the duty of a prince 'to lay corporal punishment on them which are teachers of perverse things'² It was by virtue of this duty, imposed by oath, that in the early years of King Henry VIII Sir Thomas More as chancellor took cognizance of heresy. He had no power to try heretics, and did not; but he had both the power and the duty to take note of cases which were brought to his attention; and it was for the exercise of this authority, which he used more than once in well-intentioned and sometimes kindly efforts to persuade them of the error of their ways, that he was afterwards accused of being a persecutor of heretics Again, in virtue of the Acts of Henry IV and Henry V it was the duty of the secular authorities, of executive officers like the sheriffs, to receive and deal with the condemned It is probable that no additional

¹ Huillard-Bréholles, *Historia diplomatica Friderici secundi*, iv. 5-7, 298-303; v 201-2, *Sexti Decretal*, lib. V, tit. 11, c 18

² Hooker's translation of a phrase quoted by him from the learned Roman Catholic controversialist, Thomas Stapleton (*Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book VIII, ch 11 14, in the Oxford edition of Hooker's *Works*, 1865, ii. 503)

authority was required and that the officer had no need to await the instruction of any writ¹

The acceptance of the royal supremacy brought the trial as well as the execution of heretics under the control of the secular power. In order to give effect to the change, two steps were taken by Henry's Parliament. By an Act of 1534 it was declared that, before any heretic could be executed, the King's writ must be obtained. By an Act of 1539 the King, as supreme head of the Church, was empowered to take action against heresy. At the same time, in the Act of the Six Articles, which was intended to put a stop to diversity of opinion, heresy became a felony against the law of the land. Any man who was convicted of disbelief in the Real Presence in the Sacrament, as defined by the Act, was to be burned as a heretic and suffer full forfeiture as a traitor. The administration of the Act was not left only to the ecclesiastical courts, but was entrusted to commissioners 'for correction of heretics', and these commissioners were to act in accordance with the common law procedure, to receive the presentments of juries and indictments of accusers. This Act had a short life, but it illustrates the change made by the Reformation.

Hence we do not find in Henry VIII's reign, after 1534, that the ecclesiastical courts enjoyed a monopoly in the trial of heresy. The continuity is broken. Convocation no longer declared cases of heresy. We find trials in episcopal courts, trials by special commissioners, attainders by Act of Parliament. The sworn national commune, through its various kinds of executive, declares war on heresy, or protects it, or declares it. No longer is it the duty of a sheriff or a mayor to burn a heretic on the strength of an ecclesiastical sentence. He must have the authority of the King. It is important to bear this cumulative evidence in mind when we turn to the proceedings against heresy during the minority of Edward VI, for it has often been said that the two heretics burnt in 1550 and 1551,

¹ Pollard, *Wolsey*, pp. 209–13, and see R. W. Chambers's paper, already mentioned, on More. More's opinion of the necessity of extirpating heresy was, it is hardly necessary to say, quite definite. See his *Dialogue*, Book IV, chapters 13–15, 18.

Joan Bocher and George Parris or Van Paris, were executed by ecclesiastical authority. In the first year of Edward VI the whole of the legislation to which I have referred, from the Acts of Henry IV and Henry V to the Act of Six Articles, was repealed. The object was to allow the free expression of reformed opinion, but the tolerant dispositions of Somerset and Cranmer probably caused the change to be so sweeping. Yet it is clear that there was no idea of going back upon the view that the consent of the secular power was required for the punishment of heresy. The Act of Supremacy and the Act ratifying the submission of the clergy were still law, as they still are. By the one the King had the right to suppress heresy, by the other no ecclesiastical law was in force without royal authority. On the 25th May 1547 a certain Dr Richard Smith made a public recantation of his errors at St Paul's Cross, in which he affirmed 'that within this realm of England and other the King's dominions, there is no law, decree, ordinance, or constitution ecclesiastical, in force and available by any man's authority, but only by the King's majesty's authority and by parliament'. Moreover, in an amnesty Act passed in 1550 after the rebellions of the previous year, it was enacted that the free pardon 'shall not extend to any person or persons which at any time heretofore have offended in these erroneous opinions hereafter ensuing', and then follows a list of opinions held by the Anabaptists and other persons. The general impression conveyed by these measures and statements is rather that the situation in Henry VIII's reign had made the joint administration of King and conservative bishops too dangerous, than that the State had gone too far in assuming the duty of extirpating heresy. The Act of the Six Articles especially had set a barrier to the tendency of opinion. But nobody wished to allow the growth of the wild and fantastic views, as they were regarded, held by Anabaptists and isolated cranks. They were communistic, anarchical, and depraved. Ecclesiastical proceedings, following the procedure of the old canon law, might properly be adopted against them, provided that they were taken under a royal commission, in virtue of the royal supremacy. Hence Cranmer and others were appointed

commissioners *ad hoc* by letters patent to try such persons Two were burnt, others recanted publicly with faggots in their hands. The unhappy woman Joan Bocher, whom Cranmer had befriended in Henry's reign, and George Parris, who denied the divinity of Christ, were executed after trial by the commissioners, on the instructions of royal writs issued by the King's Council In short, Protector Somerset, when he took the greatest step yet taken in England in the direction of liberty of religious opinion, did not intend to admit any breach in the unity of the State or of English law England awoke out of a kind of nightmare, in which King, Parliament, and clergy were struggling Henceforward the bishops might be left to exercise disciplinary action under the law of the land, by co-operation on royal commissions or in accordance with canonical procedure In Elizabeth's reign ecclesiastical discipline was mainly in the hands of a commission, although on three occasions in her reign and on two occasions in James I's reign heretics condemned in the ecclesiastical courts were burnt under a royal writ¹ Legislation about heresy is a very unsafe and double-edged weapon England had enough of it in the reign of Henry VIII and Mary. The discipline in Elizabeth's reign was civil as much as ecclesiastical, against the disobedient rather than against the heretic The few people who were so perverse as to be outside the social pale might safely be left to the old procedure, and in time the growth of the moral sentiment of toleration made this procedure harmless

To Catholic and Protestant alike the heretic was one who stood outside the united Church, the Church of the faith, not

¹ This was the situation in 1401, when Henry IV issued a writ for the burning of Sawtre The power of the secular ruler was stated in the Act of Supremacy The penalty of burning, after the repeal of the old legislation in 1547, depended upon no statute, but on the acceptance of it as the customary penalty of common law, based in the end on divine law (see *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, iii 459 a, and Maitland, *Canon Law in England*, pp 176-8) Maitland seems to me to lay too much stress on the survival of the decrees of Boniface VIII in the canon law still legally operative in England Apart from the particular penalty, the infliction of which depended on the royal discretion, the exercise of the royal supremacy seems to me to be much more important than the traditional co-operation of the two powers Both Maitland and Mr Pollard (*Political History of England*, vi 71, note) seem to overlook this

of institutions When Cranmer and his colleagues handed Joan Bocher over to the secular arm, they used the old phraseology of the canon law. She was a rotten sheep in the flock, she would not return *ad sanctae matris ecclesiae gremium* The heretics who suffered in Henry's day included some—Bilney, Frith, Barnes—who would have been safe in Edward's day The heretics of Edward's day were abhorrent to all The episcopal injunctions of the 'reforming' bishops of the new learning are hot against them When the martyr John Bradford was in prison early in Mary's reign he felt moved to write to Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, in prison at Oxford, about the new Pelagians or free-willers

The effects of salvation they so mingle and confound with the cause that if it be not sene to, more hurt will come by them than ever came by the papistes—in so much that their lfe commendeth them to the world more than the papistes . They utterly contemne all learning

Indeed, until the middle of the seventeenth century, if we except those who died in Henry's reign for their hatred of images and pilgrimages, or for their rejection of the Mass or, as Barnes was, for his theology, heresy as such was an incidental feature in the history of the Reformation The martyrs who died because they would not accept the supremacy in Henry's reign and repudiate the Pope in Elizabeth's reign suffered under secular law. They were not heretics. Similarly the Puritans and Separatists were not heretics. In one way or another all believed in the one Church, based upon the great dogmas of the faith, whether they insisted on its formal unity, as More and Fisher did, or, with Latimer, confessed

a Catholic church, spread throughout all the world, in the which no man may err, without the which unity of the church no man can be saved; but I know perfectly by God's word [he goes on to say to his judges] that this church is in all the world, and hath not his [*sic*] foundation in Rome only, as you say.

And so, in Henry's reign and Edward's, the main task was to secure an order for the English Church, part of the Catholic

¹ Stype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, m. 511.

Church, which should ensure its unity in government, institutions, doctrine, and worship. Of the government, enough has been said. It secured the unity of the Church by merging it in the unity of the realm. Of its institutions, a curious mingling of secular and ecclesiastical elements, enough will be said when we come to deal with the reign of Queen Elizabeth. We must now follow the attempts to establish unity in doctrine and worship.

The formal statements were embodied in articles and prayer-book, in a new ordinal, in expositions of doctrine. The methods of enforcement were by visitations, injunctions, and preaching, by the silencing of critics, deprivations, and the promotion to the episcopal bench of those who could be relied upon. The means were commissions, so familiar to students of earlier English history, conferences with ecclesiastics and lawyers, deliberations in convocation. The moving force was always the crown and council, the ultimate sanction always the King in Parliament. There was no systematic advance, for parties were too strong. Projects were framed, discussed, adjourned, or dropped. Now one thing absorbed attention, now another. Yet in the end victory lay with the reformed doctrines. The centre of controversy was the nature of the Sacrament of the Altar or of the Lord's table.

The story culminates in two episodes: first the Act of the Six Articles of 1539; secondly, the prayer-books of 1549 and 1552. In all the discussions and during all the changes formal unity was maintained. Bishop Hooper stood out against vestments, and John Knox against kneeling to receive the Sacrament; but both were induced to submit. Gardiner and Bonner accepted the first prayer-book and were powerless to resist the second; but unity was at an end when Edward VI died. The rule of Northumberland and the passing of the second prayer-book and the Articles of Religion would never have won general acceptance. It needed the persecution of Mary's reign and the drastic purging of the episcopate by Elizabeth to restore unity. And by then new causes of dissidence were at work among the Reformers themselves. Foreign influences had made headway.

Above all other aids to differences of opinion, the Bible, which in the later years of Henry VIII's reign had been distributed in English in every church, was becoming known to the people, not only through the medium of clerical instruction, but also in the printed vernacular. It was frequently in private use. Hence the conditions of Elizabeth's reign were quite different from those in the earlier period, which we have first to consider.

During the years 1536-9 the issue was fairly joined between the conservative and the forward elements among the clergy. In 1537 the scene of discussion was Convocation, the last occasion on which debate in that assembly seems to have been free and effective. In this year the King and Cromwell had particular reason to go warily and to be guided by the general feeling on matters of doctrine, for in the previous year a serious demonstration had occurred against the dissolution of the monasteries and some new articles of religion. The articles, known as the Ten Articles, had been accepted, rather than debated, by Convocation, and the local exposition of them in every parish was a duty imposed by royal proclamation or injunctions. Special commissioners were appointed to communicate the injunctions to the clergy and to examine and, if necessary, to eject inefficient priests. The storm which arose in the nation made the King pause. The rebels, if they can be called such, had been shocked by the intervention of the secular power in matters affecting the cure of souls and the nature of the sacraments. They had petitioned for a recognition of the unity of the visible church under the Papacy, and the limitation of the royal supremacy to less sacred matters. Gardiner seems to have advised acquiescence and in Mary's reign stated that at this time (1536), as again in 1541, Henry was prepared to 'give over the supremacy again to the Pope, but that he would not seem to do it for fear'. What we do know is that he would not 'approve that counsel that would have us yield to our subjects'. He would take a warning, he would not take instructions. So in 1537 the Ten Articles were quietly displaced by the book entitled *The Instructions of a Christian Man*, circulated by royal authority as the work of the bishops and Convocation. This

was the result of the discussions in the Convocation of that year, and it marks a reaction from the policy of the Ten Articles. At the same time there was not the slightest intention to relax the exercise of the royal supremacy nor to limit its range. Bishops and clergy might be used as instruments, more suitable than roving-commissions of the Vicar-General's creation,¹ but the publication of the royal will by injunctions and proclamations continued, and in 1539 Parliament itself was used to give statutory effect to articles of religion. In response to opinion at home and to the necessity of maintaining his reputation for orthodoxy abroad, Henry became more conservative and began to take an even more personal interest in the theological education of his people. The result was the fall of Cromwell and the skilful employment in his service of those incompatible spirits, Cranmer and Gardiner.

In 1537 Cranmer, writing to a foreign reformer, Wolfgang Capito, could say of Cromwell that 'he had himself done more than all others together in whatever had hitherto been effected respecting the reformation of religion and of the clergy', and even while the archbishop was suggesting more episcopal co-operation with the Vicar-General, he required (as Strype says) direction from him in everything. 'So ticklish a thing then was it for the bishops to do any things of themselves without the privity and order of this great vicegerent.' Whatever Cromwell's private opinions may have been, he was pressing at this time for a closer understanding with the German reformers. Anne Boleyn had gone, Jane Seymour died in October 1537 after the birth of the future Edward VI. The new Queen must be of the new persuasion. Cranmer also was at this time in close touch with the continental Reformers. He maintained an independent attitude on most points, but he looked forward to a comprehensive understanding, which might be the basis of anti-Roman union. In the preparation of the Ten Articles of 1536 he and

¹ Cranmer saw the importance of this point. He was active in enforcing the injunctions in his own diocese and advised Cromwell to see that other bishops did the same. By which means, he said, 'the evil will of the people might be conveyed from the king, and his council, upon the ordinaries, and so the love and obedience of the people both secured to their sovereign.' Strype, *Memorials*, i. 123.

the other bishops who advised the Crown had before them the Confession of Augsburg and the Articles drawn up by Melanchthon at a recent conference at Wittenberg between German theologians and the English ambassadors. Again, in 1538, the ambassadors of the Lutheran princes in England had a conference with a royal commission of four prelates and four doctors, Cranmer compiled a list of thirteen articles, based on the Confession of Augsburg, and drafted a revised liturgy which was 'clearly inspired by Bugenhagen's *Pia et vera Catholica et consentiens veteri Ecclesiae ordinatio* (1537), a copy of which had been presented to Henry by the author'.¹ During these critical years Europe was waiting to see how England would declare itself in doctrine and ritual. But Henry was getting tired of these equivocal relations with the subjects of another imperial power. The unlucky marriage with Anne of Cleves hurried on a change of ministers, which the Act of Six Articles had already foreshadowed. Cromwell fell, attainted as a heretic and traitor, and the ex-friar Barnes, one of his chief agents in Germany, fell with him. The executions at the end of July 1540 reveal a fine impartiality. Two days after Cromwell was beheaded as traitor and heretic, Barnes and two colleagues in heresy were burnt, and three Papists were hanged as traitors for decrying the royal supremacy. Luther might well remark, 'What Squire Harry wills must be an article of the faith for Englishmen, for life and death'.

The King, in fact, had not gone very far in a Lutheran direction, and Cranmer was both too English and too circumspect to outrun him in more than desire. Despite the archbishop's studies in Lutheran literature, the Ten Articles, when they appeared, had displeased the Lutherans and aroused the hopes of Reginald Pole. They had disturbed the people by the method of their enforcement and by their omissions rather than by what they actually said. The omission of four out of the seven sacraments aroused most concern, and it was on this question that the conservative bishops, after much debate, succeeded in defeating Cranmer and the other reforming bishops.

¹ C. H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI*, p. 35

Cranmer accepted the result in good part and the *Institute of a Christian Man*, or Bishops' Book, went out from Convocation as the reasoned statement of clergy to people of the faith which they should hold. Cromwell's second series of injunctions in 1538 confirmed the injunctions of 1536 and laid down rules for the guidance of the clergy in discipline and preaching and the instruction of their parishioners. They were approved by Gardiner, who was especially pleased by the allusion to the Lenten confession 'Ha! I see the King's Majesty will not yet leave this auricular confession, methink I smell the King on this point.' And both parties were at one in their insistence upon the royal supremacy. The essential thing was that everything should be done in the King's name and by his authority. Henry's attitude to a General Council, which he expounded in a tract written in 1537, was accepted by the bishops—the right of consent to any oecumenical decrees resided in the head of a sovereign state. Gardiner is believed to have been responsible for a suggestion, made in 1536, that Papal bulls still regarded, through the limited retention of the canon law, as valid in England, should be confirmed in the King's name. Perhaps the most striking illustration is to be found in the Bishops' Book itself. This was debated in Convocation, and issued as the agreed work of the bishops and clergy. The King merely dipped into it here and there at first, but later he studied it more carefully and made suggestions which Cranmer discussed with expressions of the utmost deference. Latimer hoped that, if there was anything 'uncertain or impure in the book, the King would purge away the old leaven.' The prefatory address of the clergy to the King humbly submitted it to his correction, as they had no authority to publish anything without the royal power and licence, although they were all agreed 'that the said treatise was in all points concordant and agreeable to Holy Scripture.'

Yet it should be observed in this place that the treatment in the Bishops' Book of the Sacrament of Holy Orders—a matter on which, as Gairdner rightly remarks, little difficulty was found in coming to an agreement—opened the way to all the later controversies on the nature of the Church. This part of the

book was composed with great restraint and moderation. Much stress is laid upon the point that the spiritual power of priests and bishops is no tyrannical power, but is a moderate power, subject to the limits and ends for which it was appointed by God's ordinance. In a document of this time signed by several bishops, including the Catholic John Stokesley, Bishop of London, we read

Other places of Scripture declare the Highness and Excellency of Christian Princes Authority and Power, the which of a truth is most high, for he hath Power and Charge generally over all, as well Bishops and Priests as other. The Bishops and Priests have charge of Souls within their own Cures, Power to minister Sacraments, and to teach the Word of God; to the which Word of God Christian Princes knowledge themselves subject, and in case the Bishops be negligent, it is the Christian Princes Office to see them do their Duty¹

If the first sentence of this pronouncement is limited by the last, there is nothing here to which a Catholic apologist could object, but it is obvious that two opposed trains of reasoning could be followed from the passage and, still more, from the exposition in the Bishops' Book. The one, as we shall see, was followed by Cranmer. The other emphasized the divine sanction given to the authority of the ministers of the Church, made episcopal government a mark of the Church, and claimed that any society which was part of the Church militant on earth must be organized, on its spiritual side, under a continuous hierarchy. This is the position of Hooker, and it is not inconsistent with the conception of identity of Church and State, organized as one whole under the King in Parliament. It says that, in virtue of the general acceptance of the divine law, found in Scripture, as the basis of social order, the State must be spiritually guided or governed in a particular way. But the next step in the argument was easy, namely that this government in accordance with the law of God had a separate validity in itself apart from the State, that the Church of England is a moral if not a legal corporation, an expression, apart from the secular order, of the universal Church, that the bishops are much more than isolated officials

¹ Printed by Burnet in his collection of records added to Book III, No. x.

who can trace their authority back to the Apostles. There is no evidence that such views had any weight in Tudor England, but the door to them was never closed. In Henry VIII's reign, when the difficulty lay rather in the maintenance than in the destruction of continuity, and episcopal authority was of practical necessity for securing order and unity, and yet was an object of everyday criticism from all sides, nobody saw the slightest justification for closing it.

The object of the Ten Articles, and of the *Institutes of a Christian Man* or the Bishops' Book, as it was the object of all the definitions of the age, was the attainment of peace and unity. When Cromwell, as the King's vicegerent in Convocation, opened the proceedings of Convocation in 1537, he declared that 'the King studieth day and night to set a quietness in the Church, and he cannot rest until all such controversies be finally debated and ended through the determination of you, and of the whole Parliament'. The Bishops' Book and the royal injunctions did not still controversy. At the end of 1538 the King had to summon the justices of the peace to his aid. They had been very helpful in putting down the supporters of the Pope, they must now detect and punish the seditious people who misrepresented the injunctions and the 'cankered persons' who so read them as to be unintelligible. Some people, Henry complained, actually set it about that the injunction for the keeping of church registers was a prelude to the taxation of christenings, weddings, and burials, and that the rigorous extirpation of the cult of St. Thomas Becket was a step to the abolition of the liberties of the realm for which the saint had died.¹ The instructions to the justices came between two general proclamations against disputes and disorder among the people, defining which ceremonies could still be used in church, and enjoining the bishops and clergy to instruct the people every Sunday on their 'right use and effect'. Finally, Parliament came to the rescue. At last

¹ The injunctions of 1538 ordered *inter alia* the keeping of registers and also the abolition of any commemoration of St. Thomas Becket. Becket had long been the symbol of the old order in popular controversies. In the course of his trial in Edward VI's reign Bishop Bonner was described by Sir Thomas Smith as wishing to be another Becket. The fear that supremacy might turn to absolutism is significant.

there would be 'thorough unity and uniformity'. After a committee of bishops had failed to come to agreement, the laity, led by the Duke of Norfolk, took the business in hand, and in spite of lengthy objections raised by Cranmer and five other bishops, the Act of the Six Articles was passed. The conservatives had won, and they had won through king and laity. The orthodoxy of England was grounded in the royal supremacy and Parliament. The people, wrote the French ambassador, showed great joy An unknown lord wrote

And also news here, I assure you never prince shewed himself so wise a man, so well learned, and so catholic, as the king hath done in this parliament With my pen I cannot express his marvellous goodness, which is come to such effect, that we shall have an act of parliament so spiritual, that I think none shall dare say, in the blessed sacrament of the altar doth remain either bread or wine after the consecration nor that a priest may have a wife nor that it is necessary to receive our Maker 'sub utraque specie', nor that private masses should not be used as they have been nor that it is not necessary to have auricular confession ¹

The Act did not imply reaction; rather it was a definition of heresy in matters which were under dispute The bishops as a whole believed in the real presence, though they might differ about the interpretation of it Communion in both kinds had never been allowed and auricular confession had never been forbidden Many clergy had married, but celibacy was still the law of the Church. It was intended to put a stop to all further disputes on these issues, and to make heresy about them part of the criminal law, administered by the royal justices as well as by the ecclesiastical courts The Act had a political as well as a religious origin and was not strenuously enforced until four years later. Latimer and Shaxton, the bishop of Salisbury, resigned their bishoprics, and Gardiner displaced Cranmer in the royal counsels. Then, in 1543, persecution was more active. Gardiner had helped to bring about an Anglo-imperial alliance and, as ambassador in Germany in the previous year, had argued with Lutheran divines and had secret, but authorized,

¹ *Memorials of Cranmer*, 1. 415-16.

negotiations with the Pope In 1543, largely through his influence, the Bishops' Book was succeeded by the King's Book, *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, in which the sacraments were discussed more fully and, to Cranmer's chagrin, the tone was more orthodox The royal share in it was greater than in the Bishops' Book, and during the rest of his reign Henry did not modify his position One thing he would not do he would never surrender his own judgement. At one time, his last Queen, Catherine Parr, was in serious danger from her dallying with heresy, and her enemies expected her fall, but Henry was placated by a humble and graceful submission At another time, everybody was expecting the fall of Cranmer, whose diocese and cathedral were by no means so united as the conservatives would have wished Cranmer had urged more drastic action against images, and seized any opportunity to press his views on the King He had appointed six preachers, three of the old, three of the new learning, to be with him and to preach at Canterbury. He was known to be at heart opposed to the trend of events since 1537, the year of Cromwell's rule and the publication of the Ten Articles Conspiracy against him came to a head and a commission to inquire into the state of affairs in his diocese was appointed But Henry made him its president and refused to listen to charges against him. In his will he included Cranmer, as he could hardly fail to include him, in the council of regency to be about his young son, and he omitted the name of Gardiner He is reported to have observed that, while he could manage the bishop of Winchester, nobody else could. The rightful protectors of Jane Seymour's son were Jane Seymour's brothers and friends, with wise men of both parties who, it might be hoped, would work together He seems to have felt that unity was more important than the safeguarding of orthodoxy As he said, in the case of Cranmer: 'There remaineth malice among you, one to another, let it be avoided out of hand, I would advise you.'

Indeed, he had no reason to congratulate himself on the success of his policy The end of controversy promised in 1539 was not in sight It went on in secret under the dark and

terrible shadow of the law. The policy of the ecclesiastical régime in Henry's last years is set out in the admirable injunctions issued in 1542 by the far from admirable Bonner, who had succeeded Stokesley as bishop of London (1540). The clergy were to be orderly and temperate, to have their garb decent and distinctive, to read the Scriptures chapter by chapter every day, to preach simply and without any controversy, expounding the Gospel or Epistle for the day, to leave to properly authorized preachers any discussion of problems of the faith, 'the rehearsal of any opinion not allowed, for intent to reprove the same'. But we get a very different picture from the records of these years. The result was described by the King himself, in the famous speech, preserved in Hall's chronicle, which he made to Parliament on Christmas Eve 1545:

I see and hear daily that you of the Clergy preach one against another, teach one contrary to another, inveigh one against another, without charity or discretion. Some be too stiff in their old mumpsimus, others be too busy and curious in their new sumpsimus. Thus all men always be in variety and discord and few or none preach truly and sincerely the word of God, according as they ought to do.

Then, turning to the laity, he rebuked their railing of bishops and slandering of priests, and, in words already quoted, reminded them that it was his business to reprove the teachers of error. They were no judges of such high matters. And, he went on:

Although you be permitted to read Holy Scripture, and to hear the word of God in your mother tongue, you must understand that it is licensed you so to do only to inform your own consciences, and to instruct your children and family, and not to dispute and to make Scripture a railing and a taunting stock against priests and preachers, as many light persons do. I am very sorry to know and hear how unreverently that most precious jewel the Word of God is disputed, rhymed, sung and jangled in every ale-house and tavern, contrary to the true meaning and doctrine of the same.

Here, in the King's words, we come to the chief occasion of strife. It is one of the most curious facts in the history of the Reformation, that in the very years when the most drastic law

of its kind in the history of England was on the statute book, to enforce rigidity and uniformity of doctrine, the Scriptures had been officially spread broadcast through the land in the English tongue.

The use of the Scriptures as the authority which justified most of the great changes in England, and the fervent interest in Biblical study shown by Cranmer and the reforming party in the Church had made the publication of the English Bible under official sanction simply a question of time, and the limitations upon its circulation a matter of expediency. Further, the revival of Biblical study was part of what is sometimes termed the Christian renaissance as a whole. It influenced Catholic humanism everywhere. Sir Thomas More, for example, repudiated the charge that the bishops were hostile to an English Bible as such, if it were purged of the errors of Wycliff and Tindale, and issued without tendentious comment and prefaces. His own view was unequivocal. He had never heard any reason why the Bible should not be translated, and for his part he would not 'withhold the profit that one good devout unlearned layman might take by the reading, not for the harm that a hundred heretics would fall in by their own wilful abusion'. It was the duty of ordinaries to take great care about the text and to exercise discretion in allowing its use, just as a father appoints 'which of his children may for his sadness keep a knife to cut his meat, and which shall for his wantonness have his knife taken from him for cutting of his fingers'. More was profoundly convinced that heresy did not come from the common men, but from spiritual and intellectual pride.

Seldom hath it been seen that any sect of heretics hath begun of such unlearned folk as nothing could else be [i.e. knew nothing but] the language in which they read the scripture, but there hath always commonly these sects sprung of the pride of such folk as had, with the knowledge of that tongue, some high persuasion in themselves of their own learning beside.

In a rather more timid spirit very much the same view was taken, after very free and open compromise, by an assembly of prelates and divines which the King had called together in May

1530 The occasion of this conference was the dangerous spread of heretical books, mainly written or printed abroad Warham, the archbishop, circulated an account of the proceedings After instructing preachers to denounce the pernicious writings of the new learning, he describes a discussion which had taken place during the conference on the advantage and disadvantages of an English Bible The general opinion was definitely against an authorized translation at that time, but the King declared his intention of having the New Testament faithfully and freely translated by learned men, so that it might be issued at a more convenient season In the epoch-making year 1534 the upper House of Convocation authorized Cranmer, the new archbishop, to petition the King on the same two points the extirpation of pernicious books and the translation of the Bible, also on the prohibition, under penalty, of disputations by the laity on matters of faith and on the Scriptures These matters are always found together the desire to give access to the Scriptures, and the concern with popular disputes on religious things

It is not necessary to repeat here the well-known story of the English Bible, how the bishops proceeded some way with a joint revision of an old English translation,¹ how the late Austin Friar, Miles Coverdale, completing the labours of Tindale, printed at Zurich the first entire translation, and how an official Bible, based mainly upon Coverdale's work, was authorized for distribution in the churches by the injunctions of Cromwell (1538). A whole Bible of the largest volume was to be set up in a convenient place in every church, the charges to be divided between the parson and the parishioners. There was to be no altercation or contention, but there was also to be no discouragement from the reading or hearing of the said Bible. Naturally enough, the response to this command was slow, it is clear from a proclamation of May 1541 that many parishes had neglected to act upon it But the great change was made and the Scriptures in the vernacular, with Cranmer's noble preface (1540), could be read by all who wished.

¹ Gardiner had translated the Gospels of St Luke and St John It is erroneous to suppose that he was opposed to an English Bible as such.

These arrangements were not so impressive as they sound. In most parts of the country, we may well imagine, things went on very much as they had always done. The village parishioners would make little of the Ten Articles and the Injunctions which were often read to them in a slipshod or perfunctory way. They would not hear of the Bishops' Book and the King's Book. As Gardiner satirically pointed out, when the Book of Homilies was circulated in Edward's reign, there was much less desire to hear sermons, either in town or country, than Cranmer seemed to suppose, and a good thing too. There was a lot of unnecessary fuss and the people were quite indifferent.

So with the Bible. We must not suppose that there was a general rush to hear or desire to read. It would lie solitary in the church in most places. On the other hand, efforts were made during these years to bring home to the people the meaning of the faith and the solemnity of the sacraments. (We know from Hooper's visitation of his diocese in 1551 how appallingly ignorant all the clergy were, how unfitted to obey the episcopal injunctions to preach and teach.) Cranmer enjoined his clergy in 1538 to admit no young men or women to their first Communion until they had recited openly in church the *Pater Noster*, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue. And we know that in some places the presence of the large Bible encouraged persons who could read and had the courage or the vanity or the evangelical desire, as the case might be, to improve the occasion, to gather people about them. Some read only, others ventured to expound. The conservatives became alarmed. They had not approved the translation as such. Gardiner, for example, objected to the attempt to give English equivalents of the numerous words, *ecclesia*, *sacramentum*, *religio*, and the like, which in Latin, as interpreted by the age-long wisdom of the Church, had a special significance. Convocation in 1542 got the royal consent to a revision of the new Bible, but the King afterwards, to the resentment of most of the bishops, transferred the matter to the universities, which did nothing. The bishops significantly protested that the 'Universities were much decayed of late, wherein all things were carried

by young men, whose judgements were not to be relied on, so that the learning of the land was chiefly in this Convocation.' But this was one of the points in which the King showed his common sense. If in that heated atmosphere the translation of the Scriptures were to be made a matter of detailed theological controversy, there would be no end. In the next year, however, Parliament dealt with the scandal in an Act 'for the advancement of true Religion and for the abolishment of the contrary'. The people who presumed to read, teach, or preach the Scriptures openly in church, without authority, were made liable to a month's imprisonment. Persons who printed, sold, or kept unauthorized translations of the Scriptures were made liable to heavy fines. No person under the degree of yeoman might possess the authorized translation to read to himself. No woman at all, if she were not a noblewoman or gentlewoman, might read it. This absurd Act at any rate suggests that a large number of people were reading it. If the policy implied in the Act of the Six Articles was to prevail, the Bible ought never to have been circulated at all, for the general situation at home and abroad was quite different from that which existed even in Sir Thomas More's time, some fifteen years earlier.

The Council of the boy King Edward adopted the same policy, but in a different spirit and with a very different end in view. It did not define heresy by Act of Parliament. the statutes against heresy, including the Act of the Six Articles, were swept away. As we have seen, nobody in Edward's reign was dealt with as a heretic, except those, repudiated by both parties, who had come under the influence of the Anabaptist and similar movements. The Protector's attitude was twofold. he did not believe, and he did not wish to believe, in the possibility of repressing those who believed in innovation; and he preferred to impose uniformity, as a matter of public order, by even more systematic exercise of the secular authority. Parliament and commissions of Council were the active agents of change, as in Henry's reign, and Convocation was more impotent. The bishops were the advisers of the Crown, and Cranmer is the outstanding figure of the reign, but the co-operation of the

episcopal bench and clergy as a whole with the secular authority was not possible, while the conservatives were still so numerous and influential. Cranmer preferred to work with committees and in consultation with the foreign divines who play so large a part in the theological deliberations of this period. Gardiner and Bonner, the leaders of the Catholic party, were deprived for disobedience, not of course for heresy, just as a parson who refused to obey episcopal injunctions might be deprived. Such, in general, were the circumstances under which the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1549, and the first Prayer Book in the English tongue displaced the service books of the Middle Ages.

A lengthy correspondence between Gardiner on the one part and the Protector, Sir William Paget, and Cranmer on the other, enables us to understand the attitude of the conservatives and the significance of innovations in the first year or so of Edward's reign. The Council had decided that, as bishops exercised 'authority of spiritual jurisdiction' by virtue of the royal licence, their commissions ought to be renewed in the new reign. The new licence stated that it was the duty of the bishop to acknowledge his dependence upon the Crown for the exercise of his functions and his obligation to surrender them when required. Gardiner, protesting to Paget against the use of the word 'delegate', which appeared in his new commission, seems to have objected not to the view that he owed his commission to the King, but to the implication that his authority depended only upon the Crown and therefore that he might run the risk of exceeding it, so incurring the penalties of *praemunire*. 'I have been exercised', he wrote, 'on making of treaties.' He knew the importance of words and phrases 'It would be a marvellous matter if, after my long service and the loss of my master, I should lose that he gave me by construction of a commission.' The argument would seem to be that, quite apart from the theological issue as to the nature and origin of episcopal authority, a bishop must be regarded as possessed of a standing by common law. He was an ordinary, not a delegate appointed for a particular purpose. This was a return, though not on the same ground, to the position which Gardiner had taken up in

defence of Convocation in 1532. Paget and his colleagues, on the other hand, had no hesitation in maintaining that, if a reformation were desired, the government must expect its ministers, secular or ecclesiastical, to be pliable in executing it. Hence they brushed aside all the legal objections raised later by Gardiner and Bonner to the process, which led to the bishops' deprivation. The bishops had a definite commission from the King, they refused to execute it, or at the least quibbled and equivocated. It was not for them to argue about their legal rights as bishops. If a spell of confinement in the Fleet or the Tower did not bring them to reason, they must be dismissed, just as any other state official could be dismissed. When Bonner threatened to appeal, Sir Thomas Smith, one of the committee of council appointed to deal with him, asked to whom he *could* appeal? He could not appeal to the Pope, and if he appealed to the King and Council, he was appealing to the body which was actually trying him. A plea of unlawful dismissal could not lie against the Crown. This was the way in which Elizabeth dealt with the bishops at the beginning of *her* reign. After the fall of Somerset, the bishops in the House of Lords strove to regularize their position. Their authority, they said, was despised by the people and their jurisdiction annulled by proclamations¹. But, though they were invited to draw up a Bill, nothing definite was done.

In the face of this attitude Gardiner could not hope to stem the tide of innovation. He argued that King Henry's settlement was wise and should be regarded as fixed, until the King came of age. So great was his admiration for it that he wrote of it almost as though it should be treated as a fundamental thing, part of the common law of the land.

Though some would say that he [Henry VIII] had in knowledge but one eye and saw not perfectly God's truth, yet for us it were better to go to heaven with one eye after him, than to travail here for another eye with danger to lose both. . . If the wall of authority which I accounted established is once broken, and new water let in at a little gap, the vehemency of novelty will flow farther than your Grace would admit.

¹ Gardiner, iii 172

So he wrote to Cranmer about the Book of Homilies, and earlier in this year 1547 he wrote to Somerset about a scheme of reform laid down by Barlow, bishop of St Davids, in one of his sermons.

If my Lord of St David's or such others have their head cumbered with any new platform, I would wish they were commanded, between this and the King's Majesty's full age, to draw the plot diligently, to hew the stones, dig the sand and chop the chalk in the unseasonable time of building, and when the King's Majesty cometh to full age to present their labours to him, and in the meantime not to disturb the state of the realm . In quiet ye be strong, in trouble ye be greatly weak

Somerset did not read the facts like this He sympathized with the innovations and regarded England as one of the reformed countries, and he entirely refused to agree that Henry VIII had left matters in a satisfactory condition There was doubt and disorder everywhere in opinion, and a new effort must be made to secure uniformity. This is the burden of the preamble to the Act of Uniformity in 1549, and of a letter to the Princess Mary in July The princess had urged that her father had secured godly order and quietness with general consent Somerset marvelled at this interpretation of the past and proceeds:

Then was it not that all the spirituality nor yet the temporality did so fully assent to his godly orders as your Grace writeth of Did not his Grace also depart from this life before he had fully finished such godly orders as he minded to have established to all his people if death had not prevented him? Is it not most true that no kind of religion was perfited at his death but left all uncertain, most like to have brought us in parties and divisions if God had not only helped us? And doth your Grace think it convenient it should so remain? God forbid

It is not necessary to describe at length the new effort after Uniformity To these years (1547-53) we owe the Prayer Book, the Ordinal, the Articles; at this time the right of the clergy to marry was acknowledged by Convocation and ratified by Parliament The innumerable chantries were abolished, and a crusade undertaken against images, crucifixes, and so-called idolatry of all kinds The teaching of the bishops and clergy

became increasingly Protestant, and the Sacrifice of the Altar became the communion in both kinds. And disturbance grew, just as it had grown after the previous settlement of 1534-9. Something must be said of the way in which these things were done, and by whom they were done, and of the effect of them upon the temper of the people.

In all that was done the initiative was taken by the Protector and his colleagues in the Council of regency. The important changes were debated in Parliament and were given the authority of Parliament. Convocation might or might not be invited to co-operate. In form, therefore, we see little change of procedure in the reign of Edward VI. But the conditions were in reality very different. Hitherto the personality of the King had been dominant everywhere, now the leaders in policy were men who worked increasingly under the influence of party. In order to justify himself in the face of Gardiner's criticisms the Protector had to procure the repeal of the Act which 'would have enabled the King, when he attained the age of twenty-four to annul all Acts of Parliament passed in his minority simply by letters patent'. Similarly, the repeal of the Act of the Six Articles was necessary before Cranmer and the bishops could safely discuss the theological questions relating to the Mass. Gardiner argued with much truth that the new Government, by refusing to mark time during the period of the royal minority, was in fact guilty of a breach of trust. It was not leading a united people with due respect for the constitutional ideas implied in the rule of King in Parliament, but was dragging the people in the wake of a party. In Gardiner's view the new policy of uniformity in preaching, liturgical order, and discipline was a tyrannical interference with a traditional system which was in itself good and would continue to work well if the government would maintain order and keep the balance even. He thought that the general visitation of the kingdom and the enforcement of injunctions issued by the council were illegal, and he detested the new book of homilies issued in the first months of the new reign. His criticism led to his first detention, just as his balanced survey of the general position and his

adherence to the old theology led later to his long imprisonment. He wished the people to be left alone. 'Truth', he wrote to Cranmer, 'is able to maintain itself and needeth no help of untrue allegations.'

Although there was much wisdom in Gardiner's view, he undoubtedly failed to realize, indeed he could not have realized, that only Henry VIII himself could have done what he desired the Protector to do. As we have seen, the picture of peace and unity drawn by Gardiner was very far from the facts even in the late king's reign. The Protector would have found it hard to stand still, even if he had wished. In any case his personal inclinations led him to co-operate with Cranmer in seeking a solution for the burning question of the day, the controversy about the Sacrament of the Altar. England was involved in the issue which had rent the Protestants of Germany asunder, and was now regarded as the essential issue between the more advanced reformers and the Roman Church. In the letters and controversial writings of these years we find little concern with the nature of the Church. The new men around Cranmer, whether Englishmen or foreigners, were not disturbed by this problem, as were the refugees who came back to England after Mary's reign ten or twelve years later. Nor does it seem to have troubled the conservative bishops, men like Tunstall of Durham and Thirlby, the bishop of the new and temporary see of Westminster, nor Gardiner himself, provided that the policy of Henry VIII was respected. The reforming element looked to the King and council as a matter of course. Hooper, the former Cistercian monk, who came back to England from exile in the spring of 1549 with ideas far more definitely fixed than those of most of his English friends, and with a rigid conscience which was shortly to involve him and the government in trouble, saw in the young king and his advisers the way of salvation.

O how great shall the King's Majesty and the Council's reward be for their thus doing! They shall triumph for ever with God in such joys as never can be expressed with tongue or pen, without end in heaven, with David, Ezechias, and Josijahu.

And the natural functions of council and Parliament, as the

exponents of the truth, are taken for granted in the letter sent by Edward VI to the archbishop on Christmas Day 1549. Referring to the new Prayer Book he said, or was made to say.

We therefore by the advice of the body and state of our Privy Council, not only considering the said Book to be our act, and the act of the whole state of our realm assembled together in Parliament, but also the same to be grounded upon Holy Scripture, agreeable to the order of the primitive Church, &c

There is not a word about ecclesiastical organization, and in fact it is now generally agreed that the first Prayer Book of Edward VI was not even submitted to Convocation. One of the very earliest reports which have survived of a debate in Parliament is of a disputation between the bishops in the House of Lords in December 1548, when the Lord Protector, 'because it seemed most necessary to the purpose, willed them to dispute whether bread be in the sacrament after the consecration or not'.¹ And, when the Prayer Book was debated and divided upon in the following year, the proceedings took place in Parliament.

To what extent the eucharistic controversy affected the country as a whole it would be hard to say. As subsequent events were to show, change was regarded with indifference or hostility in many parts of England. The clergy of Oxfordshire refused to use the new Prayer Book and many of them suffered death as rebels in the tumults of the time, the clergy in the west were able to rouse the peasants in what for a time seemed likely to be a formidable rebellion. On the other hand, the 'new learning' had widespread effect in the towns, especially in London, and in the University of Cambridge. The new government did not create, but was faced by, the agitation which the new policy was designed to soothe. The first Act of Parliament of the reign was directed against those who spoke irreverently of the sacrament of the altar, and it is clear that, under the influence of reforming preachers, the eucharist was frequently at this time the subject of popular discussion, which sometimes took the form of, or was merged in, anti-clerical violence. Pamphleteers

¹ Printed in Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (1890), pp. 397-443, from Royal MS. 17 B XXXIX.

indulged in a freedom of speech whose blasphemy was rarely, if ever, equalled in the long history of English pamphlet warfare. To this time belong the descriptions of the Mass as 'Jack-in-the-box', 'Round-robin', 'the poetical changeling', and the corruption of the solemn words of consecration *Hoc est corpus* into Hocus-pocus. Such was the setting in which Cranmer and his friends set to work to devise a settlement which should be positive as well as repressive, English rather than Latin, comprehending as much as possible of the old in a reforming tendency. The archbishop had long wished for this opportunity, and now it had come. For ten years, so far as he could, he had worked at the task. He was not a revolutionary, coming to a fresh task, but the primate whose learning and experience had been steadily directed by, and had intensified, his purpose. Since 1538 he had worked upon ritualistic measures, some of which still survive. Since 1546, under the influence of Ridley, he had passed from his belief in the real presence, which he had regarded as a catholic doctrine to be accepted, while the Roman dogma of transubstantiation was to be rejected, to that difficult view which his opponents, like many modern theologians, found it so hard to distinguish from Zwinglianism.¹ He was in consequence more at liberty to turn for aid to the foreign reformers who, generally at his invitation, came to England at this time—the gentle Spaniard, Dryander, learned in the Mozarabic rite, the cultivated Italian, Peter Martyr, once the friend of reforming Papalists, the learned Martin Bucer, who had for so long tried to bridge the gulf between the Protestant parties in Germany and Switzerland. A project very dear to Cranmer in these years was the union of the continental and English reformers in a common understanding. But he was always the primate, the English theologian deeply read in the Fathers and in liturgical history, seeking a settlement suited to English needs. He never forgot that he was a statesman, a member of the council, acting with theologians and canonists.

¹ The fullest attempt to explain Cranmer's theology of the sacrament is in C. H. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (Cambridge, 1926). Mr. Smyth's definition of it as Suvermerianism appears to rest upon a misconception of the meaning of this word.

and laymen under the informal commission given to him by the King and the Protector His independence and deliberateness for a time maddened the ardent reformers, the English and foreign correspondents of Calvin and Bullinger, who watched each act of his, and treasured with eager anticipation every utterance The conferences at Windsor and Chertsey, in which the future measures were discussed and prepared for council and Parliament, were in 1548 and 1549 the centre of the reforming movement in England

The first change, though welcomed by the Protestants, was not inconsistent with medieval and Roman doctrine It was embodied in the Act against revilers, already mentioned, and in the 'Order for the Communion', issued on the 8th March 1548 by royal proclamation and made compulsory upon the clergy by an ordinance of the 13th March The Act, which was submitted to Convocation before it was passed by Parliament, directed that the faithful should receive the communion in both kinds, as well as providing that after the 1st May revilers of the sacrament should be presented by local juries before the justices of the peace in the presence of the bishop or his deputy. The 'Order for the Communion' is a brief pamphlet setting out, in the English tongue, a short service for the communion of the laity It consists of exhortations to communion and the words of administration, and was afterwards incorporated in the Prayer Book It is of Lutheran origin, for the *Pia consultatio* of Hermann of Wied, archbishop of Cologne (1543), upon which it is based, was due in the main to Martin Bucer, and had passed through the hands of Melanchthon But neither in the Act of Parliament, which directed that communion should be received in both kinds, nor in the Order which prescribed the ritual, was there anything distinctly Protestant The priest still made his communion in Latin according to the Sarum use. Communion in both kinds, which was generally recognized to have been the usage of the primitive Church and which was papally recognized in Catholic Germany in 1564, was not heretical, while the Act, by explicitly 'not condemning the usage of any Church out of the King's Majesty's dominions', would

seem to suggest that the new order was not to be regarded as theologically necessary. In 1548 and, indeed, in 1549 Cranmer and his colleagues carefully refrained from making the ritual and prayers of the Church capable of expressing only, and nothing more nor less than, his increasingly definite standpoint in regard to the eucharist. He was more than a theologian learned in all the liturgies of the past; he was a priest who for thirty years had, in celebrating the sacrament, used words and prayed prayers which had become part of his spiritual life. The language of the Order for the Communion and of the Prayer Book grew out of his religious experience; it was much more than the literary expression of his theological learning. Even the changes made in the second Prayer Book of Edward VI are regarded in some theological quarters as capable of a wider interpretation. But I am not competent, and am not here called upon, to express any opinion in this difficult controversy.

The first Prayer Book, which followed a month after the Order for the Communion, was the next step in a Protestant direction. It was prepared by a commission and seems to have been submitted by the Council to a 'synod of bishops', to use Bucer's phrase, in October 1548. With the exception of Day, bishop of Chichester, all the bishops accepted the book, but several, of whom Thirlby was the chief, agreed to it in general for the sake of unity, while reserving some points, notably the omission of the elevation of the host, in the hope that full agreement would be reached later. The book next came before Parliament. In a very interesting letter to Bucer, who had not yet come to England, Peter Martyr gave his impressions of the recent debate. He wrote from Oxford on the 28th December:

The other matter which distresses me not a little is this, that there is so much contention among our people about the eucharist, that every corner is full of it. And even in the supreme council of the state, in which matters relating to religion are daily brought forward, there is so much disputing of the bishops among themselves and with others, as I think was never heard before. Whence those who are in the lower house, as it is called, go up every day into the higher court of parliament, not indeed for the purpose of voting, (for that

they do in the lower house), but only that they may be able to hear these sharp and fervent disputationes. Hitherto the popish party has been defeated, and the palm rests with our friends, but especially with the Archbishop of Canterbury, whom they till now were wont to traduce as a man ignorant of theology, and as being only conversant with making of government, but now, believe me, he has shewn himself so mighty a theologian against them as they would rather not have proof of, and they are compelled against their inclination to acknowledge his learning and power and dexterity in debate. Transubstantiation, I think, is now exploded, and the difficulty respecting the presence is at this time the most prominent point of dispute, but the parties engage with so much vehemence and energy as to occasion very great doubt as to the result for the victory has hitherto been fluctuating between them.

The report which survives of this debate shows that with the exception of the Protector and the Earl of Warwick (the later Duke of Northumberland) the bishops were the disputants in the crowded assembly. Some concessions were made, notably the substitution of the words *flesh* and *blood* for *bread* and *wine*. Bonner had insisted that the doctrine implied in the latter was not decent, 'because it hath been condemned abroad as an heresy; and in this Realm example of Lambert'. But the conservatives were voted down on the book as a whole when it came to the final vote on the Act of Uniformity, by which it was authorized (21st January 1549). The critical debates had been upon the eucharist, but the Prayer Book, it is unnecessary to say, comprised a revised breviary and orders for all the rites and ceremonies of the Church as well as the order for the Communion. It was part of a plan for uniformity, and displaced all the old service books. Drawing upon the Use of Sarum and many other liturgies, old and new, it provided for the Church of England, after many years of striving, a service book in the English tongue, designed to draw all men of goodwill into unity. The hope was not fulfilled.

In form the Act of Uniformity was like that previous Act of Uniformity known as the Act of the Six Articles. Refusal to adopt the new Book of Common Prayer, or agitation and

speaking against it, involved the offender in penalties imposed by the State. Although a concurrent jurisdiction was explicitly allowed to the ecclesiastical courts, the justices of oyer and terminer and the chief officers of cities and boroughs were empowered to administer the Act. A parson was, for the second offence, to be imprisoned for a year and deprived *ipso facto* of all his spiritual promotions; for the third offence he might be imprisoned for life. But, whereas proceedings under the Act of the Six Articles were taken against innovators, proceedings under the Act of 1549 would be taken against those who resisted innovation and clung to books and practices which had an immemorial history. The reaction against the later Act was naturally more immediate and more profound, though less informed by deliberate and reasoned conviction, and less enduring than the opposition to the Act of Henry VIII. The rebellions of 1549 were not inspired by theological passion. The theological controversies were difficult and obscure, beyond the mental grasp of country clergy and peasants. The teaching of the new Prayer Book, in spite of its Protestant tendencies and colouring, was not clearly heterodox. Gardiner, who occupied himself at this time in elaborate writings upon the Sacrament, was prepared to accept the new book, and indeed was to jibe bitterly at the inconsistency between its implied theology and the archbishop's teaching on the Lord's Supper. Dryander explained to Bullinger that the 'absurdities' of the Book were due to the differences of opinion among the bishops. The real cause of the opposition of country clergy and Devonshire peasants was the proof which the Prayer Book seemed to give that all the agitations and change of the last few years really were going to end in a permanent cleavage between the past and the present, that the familiar was to give way to something strange, foreign, imposed. In their own way, surrounded by evidences of change, they felt as Peter Martyr did, that too much had been done for withdrawal to be possible, that things must move further. And, whereas Peter Martyr and his friends rejoiced, they were stirred to anger and resentment. They had seen the monasteries go, they had seen the royal commissioners breaking down images in

accordance with the injunctions of 1547 and the orders in council of 1548, at this very time the chantries, witnesses in nearly every church of the ever-present solicitude of the living for the dead, of the religious bond in every gild and fraternity, were being destroyed and their resources, the gifts of local piety, confiscated to the crown. Their resistance was speedily suppressed; for while they were for the time in earnest, others were hostile to them or lukewarm or timid. But the persuasiveness of Cranmer and the fiery rhetoric of the preachers failed to bring the country to willing acquiescence in the new order. The persecutions in Mary's reign, acting upon the mind of a new generation, and gradual familiarity with new ways of life, and with words which all could understand, and the opening up of new issues, in which the governing powers were on the conservative side, and the rally of patriotic feeling against external interference, all these were necessary before the Reformation settlement could be accepted as a matter of course.

In the meanwhile, encouraged by the support of the government, the Reformers went forward. The result was the second Prayer Book, whose use was imposed in the second Act of Uniformity in 1552. This Act illustrates very clearly two tendencies which had been gathering force during the previous three years. The first was a growing concern with ecclesiastical order involving the discipline of the laity. The second was the desire to interpret the meaning of the Sacrament of the Altar more clearly in a Zwinglian sense. The Act, while retaining the Act of 1549 in full force, was mainly concerned to secure the diligent and faithful attendance of the people at their parish churches at times of common prayer and other services of the Church. It went farther in this direction than any previous Act of Parliament.

The ecclesiastical authorities were exhorted to execute this part of the Act and were given 'full power and authority by this Act to reform, correct and punish' the recalcitrant 'by censures of the Church'. The civil authorities, whose duty it was to proceed against the clergy and laity under the earlier Act, still in force, were required in the second Act to deal with

persons who were present at any other form of service than that authorized in the Prayer Book. Now here we have the development which had been anticipated with dismay by Gardiner, and we can see the triumph of the foreign ideas of discipline which were so distasteful to him, as to most Englishmen, and which he had attacked in his controversy with Bucer in Germany years earlier. It would doubtless be extravagant to suppose that Bucer's influence had been responsible for the change. Indeed, he thought that an intensive educational campaign by preachers was more important and would be more effective than a policy of legal discipline. Several active prelates, including Ridley, who had succeeded Bonner as bishop of London in 1550, Hooper, who, after much disputation about episcopal vestments, was consecrated bishop of Gloucester in March 1551, Coverdale, who was consecrated bishop of Exeter in August of the same year, were at work in their dioceses with firm convictions about the necessity of order. Ridley especially had for some time taken the lead in diocesan administration. But Bucer put the case for social and religious organization more clearly than anybody. Before he came to England Peter Martyr had bewailed to him the absence of men who were conversant with ecclesiastical order and government, and when he arrived and settled in Cambridge, he was much distressed by the state of the country. In his *De regno Christi*, presented to the King as a New Year's gift in 1551, he dealt in a very outspoken way with the need for reform. As I have said, we find little concern during this time with the nature of the Church and with the ideal relations of Church and State; but in Bucer's work we can see a lively concern for the formation of a well-ordered community worthy of the new truths now opened out to it. Like Latimer, he denounced the spoliation of the Church, the greed and indifference of the new nobility, the conversion by King and nobles alike of ecclesiastical wealth to secular uses or enjoyment. He was in favour of regulating social life—games, food, dress—of reforming the universities more drastically, and most of all, of a clear policy in regard to marriage and divorce. Concern with such matters was, of course, not new. Medieval

secular legislation had dealt with, and the canon law was precise and minute about, most of them. But Bucer illustrates the policy, which most continental Reformers had in varying degree found to be necessary, of social and moral discipline in the light of the new religion; he felt the fervent desire to combine regulation with godly persuasion in an attempt to turn the self-contained State into a veritable Kingdom of God His ideal was prophetic, and in due time was to develop into the conception of the State as subservient to the Church, the authorized guide in faith and morals Gardiner had gone to the root of the matter when, in opposition to Bucer, he had deprecated minute interference in the moral and religious life of the individual, and had maintained that 'the contempt of human law was to be punished more heavily and more seriously than any transgression of the divine law', or when he had rather cynically criticized Cranmer's enthusiasm for homilies and attendance at Church and the reading of the Scriptures by the laity Whether he was right or wrong, he had a more accurate acquaintance than the Reformers had with the character of his countrymen Nor were his countrymen the more disposed to welcome the new discipline because it was imposed upon them by a government led by the duke of Northumberland, one of the most cynical scoundrels who has ever held high office in England

A letter from Bucer and Fagius, the Hebraist and preacher, written to their friends in Strasbourg very soon after their arrival in England in April 1549, shows that within a few weeks of the passing of the first Act of Uniformity, Cranmer was looking forward to a revision of the Prayer Book. The new-comers were entertained at Lambeth, with Peter Martyr, Dryander, Immanuel Tremellius of Ferrara, and some 'godly Frenchmen'. The cause of religion and the state of the country were freely discussed. The country needed teachers above all, for hitherto the clergy had confined their duties chiefly to ceremonies Bucer considered that the definitions of rites and doctrines were fairly satisfactory. He was assured that the concessions which had been made to antiquity and to human infirmity, the eucharistic

vestments, the use of candles and chrism, were not superstitious and would only be retained for a time. It was refreshing to find that all the services were now read or sung in English, that the doctrine of justification was purely and soundly taught and the eucharist administered according to Christ's ordinance, private masses having been abolished. Less moderate critics, notably Hooper, were not so satisfied. Shortly before he was made bishop of Gloucester, Hooper, preaching before the King, did not hesitate to demand the abolition of useless and superstitious ceremonies and the revision of the book, while Ridley, in the articles of his diocesan visitation of May 1550, concentrated, not on the observance of the new order as a means of peace, but upon the foolish practices which, though not illegal, too often accompanied it. He instructed his clergy, in the cause of a sensible uniformity, to provide a table in some convenient place in the choir or sanctuary and to remove the altar. In the course of the next month the grand altar in St. Paul's and the altars in the London churches were destroyed. The council, late in the year, adopted Ridley's view. The bishops were commanded to replace altars by tables, on the ground that the words altar and table were used indifferently in the Prayer Book, which therefore gave no superior sanction to the more superstitious use. Soon afterwards, in 1551, Ridley took a further step in repudiation of the sacrificial doctrine of the communion and, by officiating on various sides of the table or by placing it in different positions, made it clear that, in his view, there was no need for the table to be in a definite place. The actions and injunctions of the bishop of London were expressions of an impatient desire for change, which by the beginning of 1551 had affected king, council, and many others, as well as the foreign scholars in England. In January Sir John Cheke, the King's tutor, assured Peter Martyr that if the bishops did not move in the matter the King would make the necessary changes in the Prayer Book himself and impose his authority upon Parliament.¹ At last,

¹ *Memorials of Cranmer*, II 664, letter of Peter Martyr to Bucer, 10 Jan 1551. Peter did not use the official style. He began the year on the 1st January.

at the end of 1551, a commission was appointed to revise the Prayer Book¹

The second Act of Uniformity was passed on the 14th April 1552, but was not to come into force until the 1st November. An episode which occurred during the interval showed how difficult united action was. In the previous year Hooper, after his appointment to Gloucester, had provoked a crisis at court by his refusal to wear the episcopal vestments at his consecration. After a tiresome controversy he was persuaded, or rather forced, to submit, but for a time the cause of uniformity was endangered by his obstinate conscience. He anticipated the famous Vestarian controversy of Elizabeth's reign. In the summer of 1552 another crisis was created by the preacher John Knox, a protégé of the duke of Northumberland. Knox had already made a name in Scotland as a writer and, as one of the inmates of the castle of St Andrews after the murder of Cardinal Beaton, he had been sent for a time to the French galleys which plied between the French and English coasts. Released in 1549, he served as a licensed preacher in Newcastle-on-Tyne, causing some trouble to the bishop of Durham, Tunstall, by his advanced teaching and practice. Like Hooper, he considered that it was idolatrous to receive the communion in a kneeling posture. If the Lord's Supper was a memorial service, to be held at a table placed in any position, the reception of the communion by participants on their knees was an inconsistent concession to the idolatrous doctrine of 'the sacrifice of the altar'. The form prescribed in the first Prayer Book made injunctions on the point unnecessary, but in the second Prayer Book the communicant was instructed to receive the bread and wine upon his knees. As Knox, and probably others, had encouraged the recipients of the Sacrament to sit, he

¹ See the letter from the young Swiss student, John ab Ulmis, to Bullinger (Oxford, Jan 10, 1552), in *Zurich Letters*, p 444. Both Skinner, said by ab Ulmis to have been a member of the commission, and ab Ulmis refer to a convocation, but they do not appear to be using the word, in writing to their foreign correspondents, in the technical sense. Although Convocation met on the 24th January 1552, it is impossible to say what share it had in the debates upon the second Prayer Book. It had no share in the work of revision.

regarded the rubric in the new Prayer Book as reactionary, and inconsistent with the tendency of the revision as a whole. Preaching at Windsor before the King in September 1552 he denounced the custom of kneeling. The King was disturbed by the thought that the new book contained any concession to the past which could be regarded as idolatrous. Cranmer, Ridley, and Peter Martyr were ordered to reconsider the matter. Again Cranmer succeeded in getting his way, and Knox, like Hooper, submitted, and urged his old congregation to submit, for the sake of 'uniform order to be kept and that for a time, in this Church of England'. But Cranmer's victory was not complete. When the Prayer Book was issued, it contained the famous Black Rubric, hastily inserted by the printer at the command of the Council, the rubric which, while it enjoins the kneeling posture for the sake of reverence and uniformity and as a signification of grateful acknowledgement, repudiates any suggestion of adoration, any concession to the belief that the bread and wine do not 'remain still in their very natural substance'. However modern theologians may interpret the words of the second Prayer Book, no doubt can be entertained of the intentions of the government of Edward VI.

IV CRANMER, GARDINER, AND POLE

The historical student of ecclesiastical change in England during Edward's reign cannot but wish that the King had lived and that Cranmer had been given a longer opportunity to pursue his policy. Would uniformity have been maintained, the differences between the Reformers been stilled, the incitement, which religious controversy always creates, to irreverence on the one hand and to conscientious resistance on the other, been overcome by measures of discipline and of the patient instruction which Bucer had urged? In 1552 the outlook was not a hopeful one. Feeling in the country was more excited and disturbed than it had been in 1547. Gardiner and Bonner were still in prison. Heath, bishop of Worcester, had been deprived of his see because he had refused to subscribe to the new Ordinal, or ordination services, which had been issued after the publication

of the first Prayer Book. The hostility, which had broken out into rebellion, was still widespread. At the same time Cranmer, who had hoped for peace from the reception of Bucer's careful proposals for revision, the main source of the alterations in the second Prayer Book,¹ was beset by eager critics desiring to go further. The irreverence and scoffing at religious things which had disturbed the government in 1547 were revived by the endless discussions about the eucharist, to which noblemen listened as though they were at a play, by the destruction of images and altars, by the wrangling about tables, by direct inducements to the profanation of the churches. Above all, the movement had fallen more and more into the hands of the Council and a few advisers, and was guided by coteries in private houses. Convocation was hardly considered, Parliament registered the decisions of the government. It is significant that the Act of January 1550, authorizing a new Ordinal, although it provoked some discussion in the House of Lords, approved beforehand a work which Parliament had not got before it. The Ordinal was to be devised by six prelates and six others learned in English law, appointed by the King, and it was to be 'set forth under the great seal of England before the 1st day of April next coming'. The forty-two Articles of Religion, the last important document compiled in this reign in order to secure uniformity on a clear basis of doctrinal statement, were prepared by a commission, submitted by council to the royal chaplains, revised by Cranmer again, and finally printed at the command of council with the false assertion that they had been agreed upon by the bishops and other learned men 'in the synod' (i.e. Convocation) at London.² When Cranmer protested he was told that the book was so entitled because it was set forth 'in the time of Convocation', although Convocation was not actually sitting in the

¹ A good analysis of the relation between Bucer's *Censura*, or criticisms of the first Prayer Book, and the changes in the second Prayer Book, will be found in the papers on 'La transformation du culte anglican sous Édouard VI', contributed by the Abbe G. Constant to the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* in 1911, xii 251, 266. Bucer died before the second Prayer Book appeared. For the criticisms of continental reformers on the second book, cf. Smyth, op. cit., chapter vii. I have got much help from the works of these two writers.

² This statement is found also in the Frankfort edition of the Articles.

summer of 1553 Finally, during these months Northumberland was busying himself with extensive plans for the further confiscation of ecclesiastical property, including the suppression of the great bishopric of Durham. When the King died, the government was not only acting in the unconstitutional way which Gardiner had foreseen early in the reign to be a danger; it was also, with the support of a few fanatics, pursuing a policy entirely opposed to the mind of the archbishop, and to the ideals of national reconstruction dear to men like Latimer and Bucer.

Yet, although the future must have seemed dark to the moderate reformers who had worked for a comprehensive church, the religious expression of a united people, and although it looked very black to reformers of all shades of opinion when the policy of Queen Mary was revealed, they may well have felt that time was on their side After the strange and moving incidents of the last twenty years England could never again be as it was when Wolsey died The settlement of religion had become an affair of State, and no reaction was possible which had not parliamentary sanction Many things had been done which could not be undone without violence to the interests, habits, and memories of the men who alone could undo them. New ways of looking at the great problems of social and ecclesiastical life had become familiar to reflective and nimble minds in council and parliament, in towns and universities, among clergy and laity alike There were men to whom the practices of the early Church, however they regarded them, had become more familiar than the beliefs and usages of their fathers, others for whom German and Swiss innovations had no terrors, others still who were beginning to say that the past had no binding influence upon the present Some men had been attracted by the possibilities of political and social reconstruction, and had no mind to let religious disputes stand in the way; others were beginning to realize keenly the difficulty of adjusting an orderly ecclesiastical system to the claims of a self-sufficing State. And for years past all had lived in an atmosphere of discussion about doctrine, rites, and ceremonies, a discussion which they knew was stirring the minds of men and women in half the countries

of Europe. The movement of opinion could not have been maintained with so much intensity if it had not been inspired and spread by thinkers of ardent conviction, or strengthened by deep currents of genuine piety. Hard fighting and strong religious feeling went together, and we should do grave injustice to the generation which had succeeded the age of Sir Thomas More if we saw nothing in it but the excitement and the lust for theological battle. Combatants of all parties, however gentle and conciliatory they might be, knew that this was not a time for 'the delicate unrealities of the fashionable preacher'. The times were too dangerous and too momentous. The Reformers were in a minority, and might for a time be scattered or held down, but the sharper the effort to repress them, the more certain they could be of winning sympathy. The people as a whole had accepted with indifference the breach with Rome, the dissolution of the monasteries, the supremacy of the King, the authority in religious affairs of the secular power. They had resented the visitations, the destruction of chantries and altars, the attempts at an inquisitorial discipline, for these measures had affected their private life. They took little interest in, for they had no knowledge of, theological controversy, but they would be quick to resent the destruction of their neighbours by the agents of what they had come to regard as an alien power.

As we have seen, the developments of Edward VI's reign had revealed the inconsistencies and weaknesses of the view which was generally held by men in authority, whether conservative or reformist, about the relations between Church and State. Each of the two chief protagonists in the ecclesiastical politics of the years 1539 to 1552 was forced back to the fundamental question of conscience. What were they to do if their belief in the claim of the civil power to obedience came into conflict with their deepest convictions? The perplexities of Gardiner and the tragedy of Cranmer raised issues which are insoluble just as the medieval dilemma from which they had escaped is insoluble. The claim of conscience in the end took the place of the claim of Rome. The issue presents little difficulty to the man who at heart is prepared to regard one authority as higher

to the other, to obey his superior whatever happens, or to suffer any penalty for conscience' sake. But both Gardiner and Cranmer were men capable of strong private conviction, who had at the same time gladly and whole-heartedly accepted the royal supremacy. Their enemies, then and later, were satisfied to say that they were hypocrites, the one brutal, the other cowardly; but these are very short-sighted judgements. The two men were as unlike as two big men can be, but both were strong men with a sense of responsibility. And both were forced to choose between their allegiance to the State and their convictions about the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Gardiner's position was probably the more difficult, and it is unfortunate that in judging his earlier actions we have to rely mainly upon his *apologia* in the reign of Mary. He claimed then that he had tried to bring King Henry back to an understanding with the Papacy, and he naturally made the most of his opposition to the policy of Protector Somerset and Cranmer. His career, if studied in the light of what we can learn of his character and gather from his correspondence, was inconsistent, but it does not suggest that he was insincere. He was primarily a lawyer, learned in the canon law, an administrator, and a prelate. He was ambitious and self-confident, disliked anything that was factious or irregular, and despised the irresponsible people who were always ready with new ideas and new plans, but did not see where they were going. In the first days of the break with Rome, his best action was his defence of Convocation, his worst the bitter defence of the execution of bishop Fisher, yet, just as in maintaining the rights of Convocation he was asserting the compatibility of two systems of law under one head, so in attacking the obstinacy of Fisher he was showing impatience with a man who could not or would not distinguish between the royal supremacy and the rest of the Catholic system. His theology was quite fixed, the organization of the Church was capable of adjustment to new conditions, the royal supremacy cut the knot in a legal tangle, and it was the duty of good ecclesiastics to fall into line. So far as he was concerned, in a world so full of dangerous and nonsensical tendencies, he would main-

tain the public order and put all his confidence in a King whom he delighted to serve. Moreover, in his shrewd dealings with men, he had soon learned that a stiff-necked assertion of ecclesiastical rights would inevitably divide the spirituality from the great laymen. He never forgot his conversations with Audley and other noblemen, and he came to insist, with all the zest of his legal mind, upon the importance of doing everything by rightful authority (*justa auctoritate*). If the clerical order could not maintain an independent position, then the Church and faith must be saved, and unity preserved, by the joint efforts of all right-thinking and sensible men in the highest court of the realm, or, in other words, by the King in Parliament. He was horrified by the lax, irresponsible attitude towards public order which he found in Germany, where for the sake of saving souls men would run the risk of social chaos. 'Many Commonwealths', he wrote, 'have continued without the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction; but without true religion, and with such opinions as Germany maintained, no estate hath continued.' Hence his objection to the acts of Somerset and Cranmer after King Henry's death was aroused by his strong feeling that the government was lightly disregarding the implications, political and religious, of the recent settlement. He had been King Henry's chief and most intimate counsellor, and he could not keep silent. He would acquiesce, even obey as far as possible, but he would neither approve of measures which had not been carefully thought out under the direction of a King of mature years, nor would he surrender his conviction of the real presence in the eucharist, true by every criterion known to him, and the bulwark against the flood of dangerous, anti-social opinion. It is not hard to understand why rather than see continue the state of things created by the second Act of Uniformity, he welcomed the reunion with Rome. Yet at no time did he utter a word in support of rebellion. On this point he was at one with Latimer and Cranmer. Just after his first imprisonment in the Fleet, he preached in the Cathedral of Winchester on Palm Sunday 1548, 'that the life of a Christian man consisteth chiefly in suffering of another man's will, and not his own; and declared

the duty of the subject to the rulers, which was (as he said) to obey their rule and suffer their power'. Resistance even to an infidel prince would be wrong. Gardiner's view, so startling to the naturally Protestant mind, that disobedience to human authority deserved or should receive greater punishment than transgression of the divine law, sprang from the same passion for public order and obedience. He meant that human law itself was part of the divine law, and that sins and offences with which human law did not concern itself were better left to the judgement of God. They might or might not be worse in God's sight than acts of disobedience to authority, but that was not the point. The sole object of human law is the maintenance of peace, quiet, and obedience. If an 'indifferent' or unimportant thing is forbidden, it is forbidden in the interest of peace and quiet and for no other reason. Similarly, matters, however important, which do not 'tend to the tearing asunder of the body of the Church and to the overthrow of human society' are not appropriately included in human law.

Slothful, sluggish and idle fellows, he wrote, spoil themselves by their laziness, they infringe God's law, yet they do not touch the Commonwealth, nor do they disturb it, still less do they cast it in confusion. But it is you who tread under foot all order, you who trample down the common weal, while you strive by covert ways to impair the authority of princes, and of their edicts, even if in your turn you are willing to listen to the truth. You adorn the authority of princes with insignificant words, yet only so long as they accommodate their laws to your own decisions, and follow your judgement in religious matters. You have not abolished the authority of Rome throughout the world, but you have appropriated it to yourselves and transferred it to Wittenberg. Let God himself teach us his truth, but God's apt soldiers will not be those, who do not willingly submit to princes. And those men will never willingly submit who discuss so anxiously of the manner of making laws and consider it of such moment that laws should be made for all men on things indifferent. Every man would gladly cast out, if he could, what he hates.¹

The tract against Bucer, in which Gardiner's views are

¹ Pierre Janelle, *Obedience in Church and State, three political tracts by Stephen Gardiner* (1930), p. 209. In one place I have ventured to alter Mr. Janelle's translation.

expounded, implies a conception of the Church as an institution held together by law, bound up with the political system, and strong enough to comprise all sorts and conditions of men.

It would be wrong to draw large generalizations from a single controversial pamphlet. The significance of Gardiner's observations lies in their casual revelation of the instinctive outlook of an important ecclesiastic. Gardiner had been trained in Wolsey's household. His practical attitude to the Church was characteristic of an active prelate of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Whatever his theorizing may have been, he regarded the ecclesiastical system as part of the country's inheritance, a familiar aspect of English life. Such an attitude is neither medieval nor modern, but English, and has expressed the traditions of the Church of England until the present day. It helped to guide the English Reformation and in turn it gained in strength and definiteness from the new settlement, so that it lived through all the later movements, which have reacted against it. It helped to enervate the policy of Mary and Cardinal Pole, and it was resolutely set against the Genevan conception of the Church-State and the separatist conception of the Church as a self-disciplined independent expression of Christian experience. The Church comprehended all, yet depended on none; was everywhere, but inseparable from the common life. The difference between Gardiner and his successors is that while he wished to retain, as part of the order of things, the traditional forms and beliefs, and saw in them the guarantee of truth and order, they have taken their stand upon the Thirty-nine Articles as fundamental.

Cranmer's attitude to civil power was simpler and more logical than Gardiner's. More persuasive and less forceful than his rival, he was more independent in mental outlook, and did not feel the need of his stubborn reservations. He rejoiced in the royal supremacy, partly because he regarded it as natural and scriptural, partly because under its guidance the religious life of England might be organized in what he regarded as a truly scriptural way. His mind was bold, yet he was moderate

and cautious in temperament. In matters of doubt or indifference he preferred to cling to the old, yet he was curious and anxious to consider the new. His moral fibre was not so strong as his mental honesty, and he acquiesced in many things which he cannot have approved. Perhaps the clearest impression of him is given by his views on ecclesiastical authority. He was deeply concerned about the organization of the Church and with uniformity. Most of the important documents compiled between 1539 and 1553 were drafted by him or under his guidance; the revisions of the canon law, liturgies, catechisms, homilies, forms of worship, articles of religion. His *Ordinal*, if we consider the circumstances, is a very masterly work of conservative statesmanship, so careful in its phrasing that only the expert theologian could detect its difference from the old. 'There is no difference between it and ours', wrote the Venetian ambassador, 'except that the ordinands renounce the authority of the pope.' It would seem that he was more concerned than Gardiner was that the Church should have its own system, and be an *imperium in imperio*. In fact, he was more free to adopt this policy just because he did not feel Gardiner's reservations. As early as 1540 he gave very frank expression to his views on the appointment and power of bishops and priests. A list of searching questions had been submitted to a number of bishops and divines. They comprised the following: 'whether the apostles, lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian King among them, made bishops by that necessity or by authority given them by God?', 'whether a bishop hath authority to make a priest by the Scripture or no?' and whether any other, but only a bishop, may make a priest?'; 'whether a bishop or a priest may excommunicate, and for what crimes?' and whether they only may excommunicate by God's law? The replies given to these questions varied greatly, as one would expect. They raised the issue which in modern times, since the days of the Oxford Movement, is the most momentous issue in the Church of England, of the continuity of the Church, whether or not, as an organized and visible body, its nature and authority depend upon a continuous ministry of bishops and priests whose

power has been transmitted to them, independently of any other authority, by Christ Himself. They are fundamental questions, and they might be answered in ways which were hardly consistent with the statutory authority of King Henry. Some of the replies given, though cautious in their wording, maintained that grace was derived from Christ and the Apostles. On the position of the prince they were silent or tended to equivocate. This view, combined with an assertion of the strict limitation of episcopal and priestly authority to the exercise of a 'moderate' power, subject to the ends for which God ordained it, was generally accepted in the sixteenth century, without assertion of any divine right residing in the Church and its ministers as an independent society.¹

To revert to the questions of 1540. Bonner, the new bishop of London, thought that 'if Christian princes had been there, they should have named by right, although the Apostles made Bishops by the Law of God; that a bishop duly appointed had authority to make a bishop and priest, also that consecration was required (and yet the truth of this I leave to higher judgments)', and that, as the Canon Law teaches, the power of excommunication belongs to the bishop and, in less degree, to priests. Cranmer was much bolder:

All Christian princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole care of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance. And in both these ministrations they must have sundry ministers under them to supply that which is appointed to their several offices.

Hence the ministers of God's word, like civil ministers, are appointed by the laws and orders of kings and princes. . . . 'And there is no more promise of God that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office.' Consecration is not required by Scripture. Christian princes have the power, as a bishop has, to make a priest, and in the absence of ecclesiastics (for example,

¹ It was expounded by Queen Elizabeth in 1559 (see below, pp. 463, 477) and is implied in the Thirty-nine Articles.

after the conquest of an infidel country), could preach, and appoint priests. Moreover:

A bishop or a priest by the Scripture is neither commanded nor forbidden to excommunicate, but where the laws of any region giveth him authority to excommunicate, there they ought to use the same in such crimes as the laws have such authority in, and where the laws of the region forbiddeth them, there they have none authority at all, and they that be no priests may also excommunicate, if the law allow them thereunto

In short, the organization of the Church under right authority was, in Cranmer's view, a matter of expediency. The teaching of Scripture did not deal with these things. Hence he might well approach them with an accommodating mind. At the same time he had no objection to non-scriptural rites and ceremonies as such; indeed, they were essential to the maintenance of order and uniformity. In his answer to Knox and the unquiet spirits 'which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy', and who would still find faults in the Prayer Book, although it were made every year anew, he denounced the error that what is not commanded in Scripture is against Scripture. 'This saying is a subversion of all order as well in religion as in common policy.' In the same spirit he approached the ideal, to which he periodically devoted his mind between 1537 and 1552, of an understanding between the reformed churches of England and the Continent. In 1537 he still believed in the real presence in the Sacrament, and he urged the Reformers to unite on this solid rock. He deplored their tendency, in confuting papistical errors, to tread down the wheat with the tares, in other words, to 'do violence to the authority of the ancient doctors and chief writers in the Church of Christ'. And, later on in the same letter to the Swiss scholar, Joachim Vadian, he wrote, 'we should easily convert even the Turks to the obedience of our gospel, if only we would agree among ourselves and unite together in some holy confederacy.' After his conversion to the views of Ridley and Bucer, he made several attempts to arrange conferences with a view to a common statement of the reformed theology in reply to the dangerous movement at work in the

Council of Trent In a letter of March 1552, to Calvin, he says: 'They are, as I am informed, making decrees respecting the worship of the host; whereupon we ought to leave no stone unturned, not only that we may guard others against this idolatry, but also that we may ourselves come to an agreement upon the doctrine of the Sacrament' Anticipating the objection that the agreement could not be effected without the aid of princes, he assured Melanchthon that the King of England was anxious to help.

Here we come very close to the moral dilemma which lay in wait for Cranmer Suppose the prince would not help, or was even hostile to the Reformers' theology? In spite of his steadily advancing opinions, Cranmer had retained the goodwill of Henry VIII, and in 1552 he could rely upon the support of the quick-witted boy who had succeeded Henry. But in Mary's reign he was ordered, not to acquiesce, but to recant his conviction about the Lord's Supper The facts that he was brought to trial before the Pope's commissioners and that his death was determined upon in any event no doubt made the final victory of conscience easier for him, but his adversaries had not spared him the dilemma. They urged the argument that in resisting he was resisting his prince, and for a time he was overwhelmed by the reflection that he owed the same obedience to Mary which he had given to Henry and Edward He was, as one shrewd observer had once observed, 'plain, tractable, gentle, mild, loath to displease' The dilemma was a real one. But as he had more than once faced Henry in the past, so in the end he faced himself, and, after one humiliating lapse, he stood fast.

It was not his death, but his victory over himself, which mattered. He made it clear that, however close the relations between Church and State might be, religion in England was not and could never be entirely subdued to public policy. For Cranmer was much more than an archbishop prepared to die for his faith; he was the most thorough-going advocate of the supremacy of the prince, under whose rule, expressed in customary ways, civil and ecclesiastical ministers supervised, each

in his own place, and each with the same kind of authority, the functions of society. He did not believe that he as bishop had any peculiar grace. But he had from his youth believed in the Scriptures as the guide to truth and the natural law; and, as he had repudiated the claim of the Catholic Church to interpret it, he could do no other at the last but depend upon himself.

The study of character in the days of Henry VIII and Edward VI is more fascinating than in almost any period of English history. The times were so disturbed, and life was so dangerous. Men in high places could not feel safe, like the poet Wyatt, who, free from the perils and intrigues of court, rejoiced that he was in 'Kent and Christianity'. Everything changed when King Henry, bringing with him a sense of dreadful and capricious power, came into the room with his little darting glance. Nobody could be certain of the morrow in the days of Somerset and Northumberland. Cranmer, a man of quiet, observant ways, had to live with a cautious intensity not often required of statesmen. As Carlyle says of John Sterling, 'it was not as a ghastly phantom, choked in controversies, scepticisms, agonised self-dealings, that this man appeared in life'. A close, very human relation with the world about them links him with Gardiner, with his love of business, and his magnificence and 'merry tales', and Ridley and Latimer and Heath and Thurlby and all the other actors in the uneasy movements of these years. And, far away in Italy or passing on fruitless missions from one country to another, another man, as able as any of these and nobler than all, was waiting his time to enter on the scene. Reginald Pole was nine years old when Henry VIII began his reign. His mother, the Countess of Salisbury, was related to the royal house, and from his early years Pole enjoyed the favour and support of the King. He was of gentle disposition, sparing of speech, meditative, but strong-willed and single-minded, of frugal habits and austere with himself. He studied in Oxford, Paris, and Padua, where he kept house as a great nobleman. He had been taught by Linacre, and was on familiar terms with the chief Italian scholars. Erasmus saluted him as an ornament of

scholarship (*studiorum decus*)¹ From the first his mother had taught him to prepare for an ecclesiastical career, and after Wolsey's death he might have been the archbishop of York, but he did not take deacon's orders until he was made a cardinal by Pope Paul III at the end of 1536, and he first celebrated Mass as a priest on the day of Cranmer's execution in March 1556, less than three years before his death. Yet while he lived so long as a layman, he had very soon made the religious well-being of England the main passion of his life. Like Sir Thomas More, he had dwelt much with the English Carthusians and not a little of their spirit breathed through his later life. He firmly resisted the incessant attempts of King Henry to win him to his side. Henry, indeed, had a genuine affection and unusual respect for him, and anxiously awaited his judgement. His wrath at Pole's ultimate defection, shown by his acceptance of the cardinalate shortly after the completion of his treatise on the unity of the Church,² smouldered all the more fiercely, and found vent in the most savage and merciless of his violent deeds, the attainder and execution of the cardinal's mother and eldest brother in 1541. Pole by this time was one of the leading men in the Papal court, the close friend of Contarini, and, like him, one of the little group anxious to reform the Church from within. In spite of his absorption in English affairs, he was anything but an ecclesiastical schemer. His mind was open to all the best influences at work within the Church. If he repudiated the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith he had none the less, with Contarini, experienced the blinding revelation of justifying grace. He had convinced himself, by ardent study, of the claims of a single united church under Papal guidance. As events were to show, he had lost touch with England and was not really fitted to grapple with the strange situation of English affairs after King Edward's death. He had become too set in his ways,

¹ Allen, *Erasmii Epistolae*, No. 1675 (vi 283). Erasmus had brought together Pole and the Polish nobleman, John a Lasco, who was afterwards superintendent of the Strangers' Church in London, and as the friend of Cranmer, Peter Martyr, Bucer, and others, had considerable influence upon ecclesiastical movements in the reign of Edward VI. See Smyth, *op. cit.*, chapter vi.

² Written for King Henry's private use, and not published till 1554.

and, though never a bigot, was too single-minded in purpose. Yet in earlier life he had speculated much about the social order, and in his freedom from prejudice was not unlike Sir Thomas More. If the statements of his former companion and secretary, Thomas Starkey, as faithfully reflect his ideas as they profess to do, his views were nearer to those of Latimer than to those of Gardiner. In his mind the medieval ideal of the prince was enriched by the vision of a government, whose opportunities of tyranny were rigidly removed, engaged upon a programme of social reconstruction. Clergy as well as laity must be subdued to the object of creating a healthy, rich, industrious, and intelligent community.¹

Such was the man who, after long and vexatious delays, arrived in England as Papal legate in November 1554 and pronounced the absolution of the erring country on St. Andrew's Day (30 November). The reconciliation of England with the Church seemed to be complete, yet in fact the cardinal could do little. The contrast between the ideals of this great man, who at one time had just missed the Papacy, and the compromises to which he had to submit and political difficulties in which he was involved, gives us the measure of the changes which Henry VIII's policy had worked in England. Pole was faced by even greater obstacles than the will of Parliament. He was suspected in imperial and Spanish quarters on the one hand, and exposed on the other to criticism and backbiting in the Roman court. During Mary's reign conflict of interests between her husband Philip of Spain and the Papacy became so great that the two powers were involved in open warfare over Italian affairs. In consequence Pole's position as legate of the Holy See in part of Philip's dominions was threatened, and, in spite of the representations of Mary's ambassador, his commission was revoked (1557). As Cranmer's successor in the primacy, he could still continue to direct ecclesiastical affairs in England, but forces in Rome were working against him. When he died, on the same day as Mary (17 Nov. 1558), he was under sentence of

¹ Starkey, *The Dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset*, written 1536-8, first published for the Early English Text Society in 1878.

recall to Rome and had for some months been engaged in protesting against the action of Pope Paul IV and defending himself against the charge of heresy, from which he had suffered in the past and to which men of keen reforming minds and uncompromising piety have always been exposed.

Political rivalry in Europe had allowed Henry VIII and the advisers of his successor a free hand. The political calculations of the Emperor and his son Philip of Spain led them to work for as easy a reconciliation as possible between England and Rome. Before he was allowed to land in England Pole had been compelled to acquiesce in a compromise which was already effective. He had himself urged upon Mary the importance of a frank and personal understanding with her Parliament, but he does not seem to have realized how far the Lords and Commons would go in their insistence upon the present state of things. The more practical people in Rome were wiser than he when they declared that the confiscation of ecclesiastical property was not too great a price to pay for the reconciliation of a heretical country. No church lands were restored save the few surrendered at the bidding of conscience, and nearly all these were surrendered by the Queen. Parliament insisted upon incorporating in a statute the Papal bull which dispensed the holders of Church property from the duty to give them up. The Pope never got back his annates or first-fruits, although the Queen refused them. The reunion with Rome was achieved by the repeal of anti-papal legislation and on the petition of both houses of Parliament. Throughout her reign Mary was unable to control her parliaments, and had much difficulty in composing a council in which she could confide. On the other hand, the independent authority of Convocation was restored, and between November 1555 and February 1556 Pole held a legatine synod, comprising the convocations of both provinces, in which the plan of a *reformatio Angliae* was drawn up. Above all, jurisdiction over heresy was fully restored to the ordinaries and the ecclesiastical courts. Early in her reign (March 1554) Mary had commanded the bishops to proceed diligently and earnestly in the repression of heresy and the restoration of order in the Church. Articles were

circulated for their guidance, including one which forbade them to use in any document the phrase implying royal supremacy (*regia auctoritate fulcitus*) They were to proceed 'without fear of any presumption to be noted on your part, or danger to be incurred of any such our laws as of your doings . . . might any-wise grieve you' The penalties of praemunire could be invoked in Mary's reign against those who took to a church court a suit regarding the confiscated property of the Church, but in its proceedings against heresy the Church was free and could rely upon the support of the civil power¹ The result was a cleavage between laity and clergy, the ashes of three hundred martyrs lay between them The episcopal bench and the ranks of the clergy could be purged, but the laity remained as they had always been. When Elizabeth came to the throne Convocation was more united in its support of Rome than it had been even in 1530, but whatever sense of relief the reunion with Rome had brought to a distracted people had entirely disappeared

Neither Pole nor Gardiner, who died in November 1555, had taken much share in the extirpation of heresy. Both were fortunate in the time of their death. But Pole, unlike Gardiner, was committed heart and soul to the traditional independence of the Church. He brought to its defence the objective conviction and missionary fervour which the shock of the Reformation had produced in earnest and godly men, especially men who had themselves felt the force of the new teaching, and were themselves reformers. In the painful correspondence which passed between Cranmer, in the time of his trial, and the Cardinal, who replied on behalf of the Queen, this issue of the independence of the Church has a large place. The clergy, Cranmer wrote,

seek to maintain the pope, whom they desired to have their chief head, to the intent that they might have, as it were, a kingdom and laws within themselves, distinct from the laws of the crown, and

¹ In February 1557 Philip and Mary issued a commission to a number of bishops, laity, and learned men to investigate, through juries and witnesses, various ecclesiastical matters, including heresy. Suspected heretics were to be handed over to the ordinaries. The form of the commission, however, is very interesting and connects the practice of Elizabeth's with that of earlier reigns.

wherewith the crown may not meddle, and so being exempted from the laws of the crown, might live in this realm like lords and king without damage or fear of any man so that they please their high and supreme head at Rome.

In his reply Pole unhesitatingly affirmed the high view which Papalist writers had expounded in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Since the days of Grosseteste no Englishman has spoken with such vigour in this strain. He argued that the law of heresy derived from the Canon Law and that even in recent times no one had been condemned for the crime of heresy 'by the mere justice that cometh from the temporal laws'. He dealt with Cranmer's protest against foreign jurisdiction and pointed out that historically no 'spiritual man' had been put to execution until he had been surrendered to the secular arm according to canon law. He then explained how foolish, how inconsistent it was with the providence of God and the very fabric of society to describe the papacy as a *foreign* power.

The Pope's power can no more be called foreign power, coming not of man alone but of Him that is God and Man . . . than may be called a foreign power, that the soul of man coming from heaven hath in the body generate in earth. And so be it in the politic body of this realm, ruled with politic laws, founded by man's reason to be called temporal laws, which cometh from princes and governors temporal, to them coming the Pope's laws spiritual, doth no otherwise but that the soul in the body, to give life to the same, to confirm and strengthen the same.

If ever, in our impatience with the abstract and unreal, we are disposed to dismiss the Papalist view of the relation between human and spiritual, common and canon law as empty and innocuous verbiage, it is worthy of remembrance that this view was expounded as an expression of the deepest truth of the universe by one great Englishman to another one of the greatest moments in English history. The legal after years of exile, attainted as a traitor, had at last seen his dreams come true. In his eyes Cranmer was doomed for a mere breach of law, but because he had broken his oath to the

Pope, repudiated the most sacred truths of the Catholic faith, and derided as an alien power the channel through which Christ, as soul within body, worked beneficently upon the society of mankind. For the first, and also the last, time the ideals of the Counter-Reformation, in their purest, most austere, and most ruthless form, were upheld in England by the highest authority in the Church. And they were expounded to a man in prison, who had done more than any other man to resist them.

The more prosaic view was that the temporary reconciliation with Rome was an unfortunate parliamentary experiment. In the defence of his *Apology for the Church of England* published in 1567 in answer to Thomas Harding, Bishop Jewel pointed out that it was beside the mark to scoff at 'parliament religion'. God's everlasting truth came from God, not from parliaments, although historically religion in England had always been, in a sense, parliament religion. 'With like sobriety and gravity of speech ye might have said, Our fathers in old times had a parliament Christ.' Parliaments, it is true, are uncertain and may err, as in Queen Mary's reign, when the Pope was received by assent of Parliament. Moreover, he was received under conditions—'otherwise his holiness had gone home again'.¹ This is another view of English history

V THE ELIZABETHAN CHURCH

Regarded in the light of later history, the 'Elizabethan Settlement' deserves and has received as much attention as any other movement in this all-important period. It can be studied minutely from year to year in State papers, correspondence, pamphlets, controversial treatises, and literature. From the point of view of this essay, it must be regarded as an epilogue to the dramatic and poignant conflicts of the previous reigns. When Mary died all the issues had been raised or could easily be foreseen. The main fabric of the Church in England stood unshaken, the instruments of its government were at hand. Its title deeds, statutes, and ordinances were all prepared. It was the task of Queen Elizabeth and her advisers to dispel the

¹ *Works of John Jewel*, edited by R. W. Jelf (Oxford, 1848), vi. 215–17.

alarms and uncertainties about its future, to open its doors as widely as possible, and to deal firmly with its adversaries. Other ways than theirs might be ideally better and stir the passionate enthusiasm of earnest men, but the lines of advance were already too firmly drawn to be abandoned. Hence, under the control of Queen, Privy Council, and Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Church gradually stood clear, freed from the dust and noise and scaffolding raised by the restorers and renovators. To onlookers it was a great ancient monument, not merely protected by the State, but the home of such far-reaching and vital activities as to require the control of the State. It was a department of State invested with prestige or ineffectiveness or shameful slavery as different minds might regard it; and time has made the investiture venerable.

In Elizabeth's reign the Church had a medieval constitution, and a comprehensive liturgy, in which ancient, medieval, Lutheran, and Zwinglian elements were welded together in beautiful English. The theology most prevalent among its ministers was Calvinist. Any independence which it might gradually acquire in men's minds had to find expression in the course of controversy, as its apologists laboured the apostolic and patristic authority for the episcopal system against Presbyterians within the Church and Separatists who repudiated it, or as they maintained the historical validity of its orders and its relations with the State against its Papal critics.

The successive changes of opinion were noted with delicate accuracy by Bacon about 1589. First the party which maintained the existing government of the Church laid stress upon the indifferent character of the ceremonies disliked by the Puritans; there might be imperfections, but these were not 'with strife to be pulled up lest it might spoil and supplant the good corn'. In the next stage they stiffly argued against change as unnecessary and dangerous to the unity of the existing order. 'Thence (exasperate through contentions) they are fallen into a direct condemnation of the contrary part as of a sect'. From this position it was an easy step to question the standing of the non-episcopal churches on the Continent and the validity of

their orders. About the year 1588 the government was being pressed to take account of the tendency of thought among the bishops, and was especially urged to make them declare their minds on the origin of episcopal authority, was it God's own ordinance, or 'the direct grant from her Majesty by virtue of her supreme government'? Opinions were sought from learned civilians as well as from the bishops. The danger was not, in fact, very great. Bancroft, bishop of London, who had lately preached a disturbing sermon which caused much consternation, did not venture to deny the validity of the orders of continental Protestants, and Whitgift, the archbishop, fell into line with current opinion, namely that whatever divinity resided in the episcopal system was not, so to speak, innate, but attached to the maintenance of order or degrees of authority, for such an end accorded with the mind of Christ. Episcopacy was not necessary, therefore, and the episcopal dignity and authority owed much, if not all, to the privileges and powers granted by secular rulers.¹ It is true, that in the course of time apologetic analysis evolved a conviction that the Church, as an expression in society of the commands of Christ and the working of the Holy Spirit, had a self-sufficing unity of its own, was in fact that state within a state which Cranmer had disowned in the last days of his life. But there is very little trace of this conviction in Elizabeth's reign, nor has it ever found general support even among those who maintain the superior authority of episcopal government and would shrink in horror from the suggestion that their strength did not come direct from God.²

¹ See appendix vi in Child's *Church and State under the Tudors*, pp. 293–304. It is curious that Whitgift's statements, given by Strype, are verbally identical in one place with the opinion written for Burghley by Dr John Hammond, a civil lawyer and one of the high commissioners. Perhaps Hammond's statement had been submitted to Whitgift as a model, for it was written in Nov 1588, six months before Sir Francis Knollys urged Burghley to insist on episcopal declarations about the new views (*Burghley Papers*, iii 366–70, 412–13). By far the clearest exposition of the definitely Protestant view was made by Andrew Willet in his great work, *Synopsis Papismi*, first issued in 1593. See especially, in the edition of 1634, pp. 277 and following. On Bancroft's famous sermon of Feb 1589, cf R. Usher in *Mélanges Bémont*, pp. 539–45.

² The chief exception is the treatise on the *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church* (1593), by Thomas Bilson, afterwards bishop of Winchester.

Indifference to it was the gravamen laid against the Church by the Tractarians a hundred years ago.

On the other hand, a different tendency making for independence can be traced in Elizabeth's reign. This had its origin in the nature of the relations between Church and State. Was not the prince the head of the Church by divine right? Did he not owe his authority in the Church to grace just as the Church's ministers did when they ordained priests or dispensed the Sacraments? Should he not be regarded as part of the Church, just as in other capacities he was part of the State? The Supremacy Act of 1534 had confirmed, not granted, the right of Henry VIII to be the supreme head of the Church of England. It had asserted that 'the King's Majesty is and ought to be the supreme head' Hence Queen Mary had not power to repudiate the title, and Queen Elizabeth did not require an Act to restore it. This view seems to have been taken by Parliament itself in the turmoil of opinion after Elizabeth's accession,¹ and indeed the Supremacy Act of 1559 did not formally invest her with the title. It re-enacted the legislation, repealed in Mary's reign, against all foreign jurisdiction, and comprised a form of oath in which, in accordance with the Queen's wishes, she was described as the 'only supreme governor in this realm as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal'. Moreover, in this reign the commissioners empowered under the letters patent of the Queen to deal with ecclesiastical matters gradually assumed the character of a permanent body which developed a judicial procedure of its own and was styled a court. In the eyes of common lawyers the Court of High Commission became suspect as a creation of the Crown, dealing with cases which might appropriately be dealt with by the courts of common law. The tendency to go behind the parliamentary sanction given to the position of the Crown was natural and in its way logical; it coincided with a political tendency to exalt the Crown, for whereas in earlier days Parliament had been the means of expression of the royal will, a customary assertion

¹ See the interesting narrative in Pollard, *Political History of England, 1549-1603*, pp. 201 ff.

of the harmony between King and people, it now began to take a line of its own on ecclesiastical and political affairs. Men concerned in administration, or given to the wide study of politics and history, urged, in reply, that in the long run lawyers and parliaments were means, not ends. 'God forbid,' said Bacon, 'upon pretence of liberties or laws, government should have any head not the King.' Moreover, the Church was vitally concerned in maintaining the prerogatives of the Crown, for it was vitally concerned to rebut the arguments of Rome. The doctrine of the divine right of Kings, as the late Dr Figgis pointed out, sprang directly and intimately from the controversy with Rome. An English bishop could not find a substitute for the Pope in a Puritanical House of Commons or seek protection in the arguments of Erastian lawyers. In Henry VIII's days this sort of doctrine had been dangerous, for then the lay supporters of the King feared the bishops: they had no intention of letting them evade that sword of Damocles, *præmunire*. The times were soon to come when the argument would be more dangerous still, and an archbishop would precede his King on the scaffold. But in Elizabeth's reign, when the Crown was threatened from without and patriotic feeling ran higher and the Queen was the object of an almost superstitious loyalty, the danger was not great. Many Englishmen, indeed, in their dislike at once of episcopal activity and Puritan interference, turned to the Crown as the natural safeguard of the normal man against ecclesiastical fussiness or ambition. The numerous Tudor families whose greatness was due to their connexion with the Crown, and was built on wealth acquired in the Court of Augmentations, felt no doubt whatever on this point. The second Lord North, the head of one of these families, wrote to the bishop of Ely in 1575:

Suffer me, my Lord, I pray you, to put you in mind who it is that you deny,¹ it is our dread sovereign lady, our most gracious and bountiful Mistress, who hath abled you even from the meanest estate

¹ Cox, Bishop of Ely, had refused to grant a lease to the Queen. North's letter is in the *Burghley Papers*, II. 121 (*Historical MSS Commission*). Cox is said elsewhere to have had very exalted ideas of the part which bishops should play in the State.

that may be unto the best bishopric in England She is our God on earth, if there be perfection in flesh and blood, undoubtedly it is in her Majesty For she is slow to revenge and ready to forgive. And yet, my lord, she is right King Henry, her father . . .

Although we can trace in Elizabeth's reign the various strands which were combined later in the argument for divine right, it would be a mistake to conclude that there was much difference in fact between the Elizabethan and the earlier settlement of the Church. Like the change of title from Supreme Head to Supreme Governor, the tendencies which I have noted had a prophetic, not an immediate significance. They were latent in any settlement attempted by the State, but even to this day they have never found unimpeded expression. The Elizabethan settlement was as much the work of the Crown in Parliament as the Henrician or the Edwardian. The difference lay in the clearer allocation of functions, and in the steadier influence of the Crown. Convocation, for example, though its Catholic protests were disregarded in 1559, adopted, with slight changes, the Forty-two articles of Cranmer, and issued them in 1563 as the Thirty-nine articles. On several occasions during the reign Convocation agreed upon canons which defined and regulated practice and discipline in all kinds of ecclesiastical matters. In 1604, after Elizabeth's death, with King James's full encouragement and consent, it compiled a comprehensive series of canons, which was practically a series of definitions of the nature of the Church as true and apostolic, the denial of which was to involve excommunication. This was the culminating point in the efforts of Bancroft, bishop of London and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, to secure complete order and unity in the Church. Yet, if we look at the other side of the matter, we find many obstacles in the way of Convocation, preventing it from becoming, subject to the royal consent, the independent legislative body of the Church. An act of 1571 was required to make subscription to the Articles compulsory upon 'priests or ministers', and this Act significantly imposed subscription only to the Articles which concern the true Christian Faith and the Doctrine of the Sacraments. Until 1597 the canons of Convocation

did not receive the royal assent and were not enforced. The canons of 1604, which involved laymen in the penalties of excommunication, were attacked in Parliament, and, as affecting laymen, were not regarded as binding in the secular courts. Indeed, the revival of Convocation was in Elizabeth's reign largely due to the acquiescence of a Puritan Parliament, which desired to see a better state of discipline, not to any deliberate assertion of power. Under Elizabeth's cautious rule, the check came from the Crown, whereas in James's reign it came from the Puritan forces, parliamentary and legal, which resented the new episcopal pressure. In the same way Elizabeth and her advisers were quick to reprimand the bishops if they showed too eager a desire to enforce uniformity for the sake of doing so, without regard to circumstances. The placable Parker, who had helped to smooth over the difficulties created early in the reign by the fanatical opponents of vestments, was a more congenial archbishop, even if he had to be prodded occasionally, than the legal-minded Whitgift, who believed that laws should always be enforced. The times were very difficult; it was expedient, indeed necessary, to have statutes and injunctions and 'advertisements' in reserve, and on occasion to enforce them rigidly, but ecclesiastical discipline should always be subservient to political good sense, and of this the Queen and her ministers were the proper judges. When in 1584 Whitgift and eight other bishops issued Articles for the control of preachers, Burghley told him that 'according to my simple judgement, this kind of proceeding is too much savouring of the Romish inquisition, and is rather a device to seek for offenders than to reform any'. When again, in 1595, Whitgift assembled a gathering of bishops and clergy at Lambeth to deal with a little anti-Calvinist party at Cambridge, and compiled a number of Calvinistic propositions against free-will, the Queen told him, through Sir Robert Cecil, that 'she disliked that any allowance had been given by his Grace and the rest of any such points to be disputed; being a matter tender and dangerous to weak, ignorant minds'. She took exactly the same line with the Commons when they tried to press the settlement

in a Presbyterian direction. The modern writers who think that the powers of Church and State, of Queen and Council and hierarchy, were combined in a fierce suppression of every kind of recusancy, have not surveyed the whole field. Elizabeth held Gardiner's view, that the task of government, in the administration of law, should not be complicated by fussy interference, that the people in a critical age should not be provoked by minute investigation into their conduct and opinions. She had to hold the balance even between bishops, Parliament, excited controversialists of all kinds. If disorder became too dangerous, the law must be enforced, but provocation was at all costs to be avoided. As she did not feel so strongly as Gardiner had felt about theological matters, she was able to act upon this view with more consistency, and, as her government was strong and national, with more success than had been possible in the middle of the century.

'God save us', said Archbishop Parker, 'from such a visitation as Knox has attempted in Scotland, the people to be orderers of things.' Popular or clerical control in the sixteenth century meant persecution, and Elizabeth could not afford, even if she had wished, to persecute. Hence she, like her father, must have the control of jurisdiction, and have it by parliamentary authority. The Act of Supremacy (1559) united and annexed to the imperial crown of the realm such jurisdictions 'as by any spiritual power or authority have heretofore been or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitations of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities'. 'Heresy and schism' were henceforward, as in the litany, conjoined in the minds of Englishmen. If the danger of schism was far more practical and immediate than the danger of heresy, this was not only due to the return to England of the exiles who had sharpened their opinions in Switzerland and Frankfort, or to the controversies which disturbed the pulpits and lecture rooms of Cambridge; it was due also to the careful definition of heresy in an Act of Parliament. In the confused debates of 1558-9, one point became

clear, that the definition of heresy was not to be left to a victorious party, but was to be decided according to rules laid down by the highest authority in the State. England was saved from the heresy hunters because conformity, not opinion, was made the chief test of obedience. The Act of Supremacy provided that 'no manner of order, Act, or determination, for any matter of religion or cause ecclesiastical' made by the present Parliament should be judged to be heretical or schismatical. This was, no doubt, an attempt of Parliament to protect itself, but it reveals a curiously insular and secular attitude to the nature of heresy. In another clause the Act forbade any commissioners of the Crown, appointed to administer the Act, to judge 'any matter or cause to be heresy, but any such as heretofore have been . . . adjudged to be heresy by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of them or by any other General Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this realm, with the assent of the clergy in their Convocation'.

As we read the terms of the oath declaring the Queen to be supreme Governor and all the detailed clauses of the royal injunctions, or study the articles of episcopal visitations, we may well consider that the exactions of conformity were more than sufficient to hurt tender consciences. But the strain would have been infinitely greater if opinion had been made the test of church membership. The priesthood was certainly closed to those who accepted the doctrine of the Church of Rome, but only a comparative few found it impossible, especially under the rather lax administration of the Acts, to take the oath demanded of clergy and secular officials, and to acquiesce in the Elizabethan settlement. And, as for the Articles, subscription to which *was* required of the clergy in so far as they concerned the Christian faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments, their doctrine in matters of faith was acceptable to all Protestants.¹

¹ The recognition of his conformity required by the government of a clergyman in the diocese of Norwich in 1578 illustrates the attitude of the rather reluctant

Indeed, they have been subscribed by men of very various shades of opinion from that day to this. In matters of faith, the government did as little as it could to provoke the 'vice of damnable despair', which it deprecated in the sinner.¹

After these general observations, we may confine ourselves to two aspects of English ecclesiastical history in this later stage of the Reformation: the administrative system of the Church, and the formation of the parties and interests which were either flatly opposed to it or did their best to alter it.

The Church of England is the most striking example in European history of the capacity of institutions to maintain an unbroken, almost complete, continuity in structure while undergoing a thorough change in spirit. Its courts and entire administrative system remained at work while it lost its connexion with the Western Church and was subjected to the daily interference of King, Council, royal ministers, commissioners, judges, municipal magistrates, and justices of the peace. Indeed they seemed to acquire new energy from a living principle which could not be defined either as ecclesiastical or secular, but was a curious compound, a sort of chemical resultant, of canonical traditions, a political reformation, and an enthusiasm caught from Strasbourg, Zurich, and Geneva. The Church continued to grant subsidies in Convocation though now they

conformist. He willingly taught and professed the Articles to which Parliament required subscription. He admitted that the other Articles, touching ceremonies, discipline, and government, were not so imperfect as to justify refusal to attend church and to partake of the Sacraments. 'And further I do judge in my conscience and find by daily experience that the unnecessary teaching of such questions now in controversy in preaching or other public assemblies, to breed disquiet in the Church of God and to bring misliking of the State now present, are wisely to be foreseen, restrained and avoided.' The terms of the recognition were not in all points agreeable to Burghley, who made some very interesting alterations. Thus a note in his hand, afterwards cancelled, reads 'that although some of the said ceremonies have been brought into the Church since the time of the Apostles, and might by public authority be altered or — yet none ought' (to refuse to come to the church, &c.) *Burghley Papers*, ii. 228-9.

¹ A phrase in the royal injunctions, where ministers are instructed to be ready with a store of comfortable words of Scripture, to save the sinner from the vice of damnable despair. It will be remembered that W. G. Ward differed from the other leaders of the Oxford Movement when he asserted that the Articles were incapable of construction in a 'Catholic' sense.

had formally to be sanctioned by a parliamentary statute, and so included in the secular revenue of the crown. It voted 'benevolences' or exceptional gifts to the crown, and these were collected under episcopal direction. Except in Mary's reign, tenths and first-fruits were paid by the clergy to the Crown as previously they had been paid to Rome, but the transaction was now under the control of a department in the Exchequer.¹ In spiritual affairs the Church exercised authority through the old system of provincial, episcopal, and archidiaconal courts and visitations, although now every excommunicated person could only be attached and imprisoned under a royal writ, and could invoke the decision of a secular court whether his offence fell within the competence of the ecclesiastical court.² The survival of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil and criminal cases which would now go to a secular court was very remarkable. The probate of wills and ecclesiastical control over matrimonial cases subjected the layman to canon law until Queen Victoria's time. Yet in the course of their general judicial and administrative work under parliamentary statute the ordinaries had often to suffer the concurrent jurisdiction of the Courts of Common Law.³ Moreover, the most important and far-reaching jurisdiction in ecclesiastical cases was that of the mixed High Commission; and the archbishop's ordinary jurisdiction was subject to appeal to a mixed court of special delegates, whose various commissions came to be known as the 'High Court of Delegates in Ecclesiastical and Maritime Cases'.⁴

Two important matters required the creation of new machinery. The dissolution of the monasteries and chantries greatly increased the wealth at the disposal of the Crown and involved

¹ Henry VIII had established a separate court, which was abolished by Mary when she refused to receive first-fruits. Elizabeth put first-fruits under the control of the Exchequer. The records of the department which dealt with them cover the period before the reign of William IV.

² 5 Eliz c 23 (1563).

³ e.g. when certain persons at the end of Elizabeth's reign began to teach systematically that infringement of the Sabbath was morally as bad as murder and adultery, both the archbishop and the Lord Chief Justice intervened.

⁴ Act of 1534 (25 Hen VIII, c 19, see above, p 397) and Act of 8 Eliz c 5 (1566).

the Crown in responsibility for the dispossessed religious and clergy Henry VIII established a separate Court of Augmentations to deal with the administration and disposal of his new property and to disburse the pensions. Some eleven years later he combined this court with that of the 'General Surveyors of the King's lands', a body which had grown out of an administration created by Henry VII. But this combined 'new Court of Augmentations' was abolished in Mary's reign when its business was transferred to the Exchequer. The business was extensive and onerous, it required a separate staff, which henceforward managed the Augmentation Office in the Exchequer. Several families of the new nobility owed their start in life to the opportunities provided by service in the Court or Office of Augmentations. As the pensioners died, one important set of duties gradually disappeared; but throughout Elizabeth's reign, the Office co-operated with the diocesan authorities in looking after the interests and morals of the men and women who had been thrown upon the world. In 1552, 1554, 1569, and 1575 general commissions of inquiry regarding the number of pensioners, and the difficulties in which they might be involved, were appointed. Some might have died, others received livings which made pensions unnecessary, some might have taken to evil ways, or married unhappily, or fallen into the hands of financial sharks.¹ If they had not succeeded in settling down, the dislike with which the secular clergy regarded them made their life all the more precarious and uncomfortable. As Mr. Baskerville observes: 'the parochial clergy looked upon them in the same light as the Anglican clergy of two generations ago looked upon Nonconformist ministers'.

An ex-monk could not take a benefice unless he could show his 'capacity', the faculty or dispensation which permitted him to be at large in the world. He was one of the numerous kinds of persons who, since the repudiation of Rome, had now to seek dispensations from the archbishop of Canterbury. This jurisdiction

¹ A special Act was framed in the reign of Edward VI to protect them 'against crafty and deceitful buying of pensions'. For all this see Mr. Baskerville's article, quoted above (p. 379).

had been given to the archbishop by the lengthy Act of 1534 (25 Henry VIII, c 21), which declared that the land was free from subjection to all human law not ordained within the realm, and claimed for Parliament the right to dispense from human law. The object was to continue in the archbishop the vast dispensing power previously exercised by the Pope. The canon law, so far as it was consistent with the law of the land or had not been repealed by statutory law, was operative in England. Under certain conditions dispensations from it had been freely granted, for example the faculty to take orders in spite of illegitimate birth, or to hold more than one benefice with cure of souls. The Papal power of dispensation was, as I have previously pointed out, essential to the smooth working of the complicated system of the Church. It was as essential after the breach with Rome, hence the jurisdiction which, under careful safeguards, was passed on by the King in Parliament to the archbishop of Canterbury. The outcome was the Court of Faculties, whose officer, the Master of the Faculties, remained the possessor of a dignified, well paid, sinecure until his position was merged, in 1874, in that of the judge of the Court of Arches. In Elizabeth's reign the Court of Faculties had a good deal of business and responsibility, for it weighed heavily on the minds and consciences of the Protestant archbishops.¹

One of the prevalent generalizations about the Elizabethan settlement is that episcopal government was lax or dispirited or inefficient. Sometimes we are told that the secular authorities shared the general dislike of ecclesiastical discipline, made light of excommunication, and undermined episcopal control by putting all the real power in the hands of the High Commission. Sometimes we are told that the incapacity of the bishops, or the essential feebleness of their administrative system, forced the government to take control, so far as it wished to take control itself. Or, again, the suggestion is made that the strength of the Presbyterian movement in Parliament and the Church, with

¹ See Wilfred Hooper, 'The Court of Faculties' in the *English Hist. Review* for October 1910 (xxv. 670-86)

its demand for a more elaborate, more articulated system of government on a local and democratic basis, was largely due to the worldliness and ineffectiveness of the bishops, while at the same time the bishops are condemned for their tyrannical interference with a healthy and natural development. Obviously these generalizations cannot all be true, even if they do not destroy each other. That between them they carry a good deal of truth is likely enough. No church can possess independent efficiency if it is penetrated at every part by political solicitude, and if its governing element is regarded as a branch of the civil service. As we have seen, efficiency in this sense was not desired. And no body of bishops can escape the charge of despotism when it attempts to deal seriously with movements or reforms, as ably defended as were the various Puritanical and Presbyterian movements within the Elizabethan Church. The truth seems to be that we are not yet in a position to estimate, fairly or completely, the efficiency and range of ecclesiastical administration in the sixteenth century. The documents which reveal it have not yet been fully printed. Yet enough material is accessible to carry a very definite impression of normal and incessant activity, and to suggest that we should distinguish, more carefully than contemporary critics could be expected to distinguish, between the objections raised against the traditional diocesan system as such and the criticism of its effectiveness. Controversialists who on principle disliked the whole thing, with all its apparatus of temporal dignity, were not disposed to be just to those who had to maintain it, especially when their attempts to impose a different system involved them in pains and penalties. It should be remembered, moreover, that criticisms came from many sides and were the outcome of very different kinds of opinion. A secular-minded laymen who chafed under the visitations of bishops and archdeacons might easily co-operate for a time with an anti-episcopal party whose rigid system of discipline would have roused him to fury if he had had to endure it. A defender of the existing order might well suggest reforms—for example, the substitution of a more localized pastoral administration by rural deans in place of the legalistic and often

tiresome control by archdeacons¹—which seem at first sight to bring him into line with the people whose influence he wished to destroy. Over against the controversial literature and the reports of judicial proceedings against the enemies of the ecclesiastical system, we must put the evidence of the episcopal registers, where the details of provincial and diocesan rule can be studied in the matter-of-fact happenings of every day. The episcopal records of that pious, hard-working, and excellent man, Thomas Cooper, who graduated at Oxford in the year of the Six Articles, and, as a convinced Protestant, was made bishop of Lincoln in 1571, give a very different picture of religious life. We see this good man, who was never ashamed to confess that his father had been a needy Oxford tailor, at the daily task, drawing up articles of faith and practice, or a form of declaration for licensed preachers, dealing with all kinds of disciplinary matters as he sat as judge in his parlour at Buckden, supervising the work of his archdeacons, arranging for the observance of royal injunctions, and engaged in all the routine of his office. Or, if we turn to the more important registers of Archbishop Parker, we can study the working of the medieval system of courts, visitations, administration of vacant sees, trials, and excommunications²

Clear thinking about the administration of the Elizabethan Church is not made easier by the tradition of persecution which attaches to it. After the first clean sweep of the episcopal bench and the first visitations, there was little persecution of any kind until the later years of Elizabeth's reign, and the Catholic and Protestant martyrs of those years were the willing or unwilling victims of the laws which protected the Queen against treason or the Church against schism. That they died for their faith they could truly claim, and legal argument about the occasion of their death may well appear to be callous and ironical quibbling

¹ See, for example, the form of government drawn up by (John Becon), Chancellor of the Diocese of Norwich, in 1578 (*Burghley Papers*, II 195-8) Becon was a contentious person (see *Dict Nat Biog*), but apparently a conscientious man with ideas of his own

² It is not necessary to describe the system in detail, and I would refer the reader particularly to the Bishop of Truro's introduction to Parker's register, published by the Canterbury and York Society.

in the presence of their heroic suffering Yet it was of great moment for the future of toleration that in the eye of contemporary law their religion made them traitors, to use Campion's phrase, and not heretics. Heresy, in the legal sense of the word, was rare; and rarely came before the old ecclesiastical courts A wise convention was gradually accepted that the high commissioners were the appropriate judges in matters of heresy, and, as we have seen, the definition of heresy, embodied in the Act of Supremacy, carefully avoided the main causes of contemporary religious controversy. At the same time, the Elizabethan martyrs, and the more numerous sufferers, who endured imprisonment, suffered for their faith They came to England, open-eyed, as missionaries of the Catholic Church, or they asserted the claims of conscience against the established order In their pamphlets and sermons, and in their defence before the tribunals which dealt with them, they did not draw a line between their theology, their reading of past history, and their position as breakers of the law, nor were their judges careful to avoid the discussion of wider issues. If theological passion raged in every diocese, in episcopal parlours and from country pulpits, in quarter sessions, in Parliament and the Privy Council; if freedom of speech in the Court of High Commission was combined with the grim persuasiveness of the torture chamber, we cannot be surprised that in the eyes of posterity the reign of Elizabeth was a period of religious persecution. The exasperating difficulties which faced the bishops and the royal ministers, the constant striving after moderation and understanding, the acquiescence or indifference or absorption in other interests of common men and women, are all forgotten; although to the scholar the crusade of Jesuits, the recalcitrance of Puritan extremists and separatists, even the more extensive and more highly organized activities of the Presbyterian section in the Church, are but episodes worked into the background of the rich tapestry of Tudor history

In the eyes of statesmen like Walsingham, for whom politics were, with much justification, a contest between Protestantism and Catholicism, light and darkness, Christ and Antichrist,

these movements, often so secret, were dangerous and embarrassing enough. In times of intense crisis, they could become the occasion of general indignation and popular panic. But in the mind of the normal citizen in more normal times they stirred a more detached curiosity, not unlike the general attitude towards communism to-day. Doubtless the government knew its own business and how to deal with them.

The greatest danger which Elizabeth had to fear was the alliance against her of Spanish and Papal interests. King Philip did not usually find himself in accord with the Pope, but the possibility of a combined attack upon England could not be neglected. It was long in coming. The excommunication of Elizabeth by Pius V in 1570 was the result of rebellion in England, not of the willingness of Spain to enforce it. Its renewal by Gregory XIII in 1583 was due to the expectation of joint action by Scotland and France and the hope of Spanish support in a great crusade against England. But Philip was not to be ready for some years yet, and in the meanwhile Mary Queen of Scots was executed and Scotland lost to the Catholic cause. During all these years of anxiety, the English Catholics bore the brunt of each access of popular fear, of each precaution taken by the English government against surprise. And their plight was made worse by the energy of the Jesuit mission which at the same time confirmed their loyalty to the old faith. The reaction of English statesmen to the ever-changing moods of European politics can be traced in the history of anti-papal legislation for thirty years (1563-93) and of the severity or laxity with which it was administered.

Although the distinction between a supreme head and a supreme governor of the English Church was not grasped in Rome, and made little practical difference in the control of ecclesiastical affairs by the Crown, there seems to be no doubt that it made a real impression upon doubtful minds. The return to Papal authority in Mary's reign had brought home to English Catholics the impiety of a royal supremacy which the ministers of Edward VI had exploited. The protests of the bishops, headed by Heath, archbishop of York, a man of

moderate temper and intellectual ability, had strengthened the reluctance of Elizabeth to resume the title. Hence the royal injunctions which followed the passing of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity warned her people to pay no heed to the perverse and malicious persons who deduced from the oath, recognizing Elizabeth to be the supreme governor, a challenge to the 'authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the Church'. Many waverers were reassured, and although, as we have seen, Protestant theologians made but small use in the sixteenth century of the opportunity which this admission gave to them,¹ the hostility of English Catholics to the new régime was moderated. Indeed, for some years there was little evidence of the existence of a self-conscious Catholic party in England. It was first shaken together in the rebellion in the Catholic north in 1569, and was consolidated later by the efforts of the Jesuit mission. Yet even after Government severity and the thorough-going propaganda of Persons and other Jesuit leaders the English love of compromise was not destroyed among the English Catholics. Many resented the attempt to destroy their allegiance to the Queen and to build up an English organization under foreign control and not under a native episcopate. They found evidence in history that England had always taken an independent line in ecclesiastical affairs. They even groped after the possibility of a national Catholic Church alongside the Established Church and praised the mildness of the royal behaviour towards them. They were inclined to be Elizabethan first and Catholic afterwards, and established that equable tradition of staunch piety combined with insular moderation which was so offensive in the nineteenth century to Cardinal Manning.

In 1559 Elizabeth published injunctions based upon those of Edward VI, calling her people to obey the recent statutes and submit to the jurisdiction of the ordinaries. She also issued

¹ A O Meyer, in his excellent work *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth* (English trans. 1916), p. 25, aptly quotes Selden's remark on the difference between head of the Church and supreme governor. 'Conceive it thus. There is in the Kingdom of England a college of physicians, the King is supreme governor of those, not the head of them, nor president of the College, nor the best physician.'

a series of commissions under letters patent. One, which, with necessary changes in wording, had as its model the letters of Edward and of Philip and Mary, set up the High Commission, a body composed of bishops, lords, theologians, and men learned in the law. Reissued at various times during the reign, this commission gave permanence to what gradually became a powerful high court, independent of all other courts, competent to supersede in important criminal matters every ecclesiastical jurisdiction and to concern itself with practically the entire administration of the Church, as defined or allowed by statute. It developed its own procedure, and was the main instrument of discipline in the execution of the legislation against popish recusants, Puritan recalcitrants, and schismatics of all kinds. The other commissions issued in 1559 were temporary. England was divided into six circuits, the northern province being one of them. Small groups of divines, accompanied by a preacher, and joined by gentry chosen from each area, were sent round these circuits to impose the oath of obedience, investigate the state of religion, and apply the Acts. As they passed on from place to place, they left behind them local committees to carry on the work, to destroy altars, images, Catholic service books, and other ornaments. Cases of discipline were generally referred to the High Commission, but the visitors could deprive priests who refused the oath, and commit them to custody. In testing the minds of the clergy, they required the recantation of doctrines inconsistent with those prescribed by public authority—‘the authority of the pope, the efficacy of good works as a means of justification, purgatory, the withholding of the cup from the laity, transubstantiation, the reservation of the eucharist, prayers in an unknown tongue, pilgrimages, auricular confession, and the various minor observances which are included in the term sacramentals’.¹ No doubt the practice of the various groups varied, and in fact the government dealt sanely and moderately with the recusants, but the success of this thorough-going commission, dependent as it was upon local and lay support,

¹ C. G. Bayne in *English Hist. Rev.*, Oct. 1913, xxviii. 648

and the ease with which the transition to the new order was made, show how little need Elizabeth had to fear resistance. Only some 300 clergy were deprived, by no means all for doctrinal reasons; they were allowed to settle down quietly or to leave the country, and as the Marian refugees from the Continent came trickling back with their set convictions and memories of foreign feuds, they found a Protestant Church awaiting them—a new bench of bishops, an English prayer-book and Bible, buildings despoiled of offence, a strong disciplinary authority, a laity (except in the north) of reforming sympathies, an acquiescent if unconvinced body of clergy. Indeed, as early as July 1559, the Spanish ambassador wrote that in six months the Queen 'has revived heresy and encouraged it everywhere to such an extent that it is recovering rapidly all the credit it had lost for years past'. No wonder that the Protestant extremists set to work with a will to shape the Church still nearer to their own pattern.

Yet, with their eyes on the Continent, and in their determination to allow no lead to a dogmatic clergy, the government, supported by a cautious archbishop, kept a moderate course. It is impossible to say how many Catholics there were in England at this time, waiting quietly for still another revolution. About 1583 the Catholic missionaries claimed that they had made 140,000 converts, a figure which, reduced to about 120,000, is now regarded as a fair estimate of the number, not of converts from Protestantism, but of the Catholics who had the courage to confess their adherence to Rome and the Catholic faith. The number was small, and though it increased to nearer 200,000 before the end of the seventeenth century, it remained such, a mere fraction of the population of England.¹ The endurance of this steadfast element in English society has a significance clear enough in our day, though its ultimate results are still hidden in an uncertain future. Its significance in the history of Elizabeth's reign lies in the heroic obstinacy with which the

¹ See the discussion in Meyer's book, pp. 59–73. Dr Meyer gives much the best and clearest account of the whole subject of this section. For the transition from Mary's reign to the Elizabethan settlement see Father David Mathew, *The Celtic Peoples and Renaissance Europe* (London, 1933), especially the first three chapters.

Catholics endured the persecution in which the papal campaign against England involved them. They were the occasion, and the easiest victims, of one of the most dramatic crusades in history. Scores of ardent young men, trained by some of the best minds in Europe, inspired by leaders of genius, steeped in learned controversy, aglow with holy passion, dedicated to death, issued from the English colleges at Rheims and Rome on their mission to convert England. They had the most fantastic ideas of the prospects of success, but no amount of disillusionment could shake them. The story of the English movement on the Continent, of Cardinal Allen and Parsons and Campion, of the disputes between世俗 and Jesuits, the sacrifice of innocent devotion to ecclesiastical expediency, the attempt to organize the Church in England, does not belong to this study of the English Reformation. Nor are we concerned with the statutes and administration which gradually made real and extended to laymen the penalty of treason which lay in wait in the Act of Supremacy. The story has often been told and must be read in full if it is to be truly judged. But the conflict reacted with great force upon the English Church. It sharpened Puritan feeling, gave form and character to English apologetics, and persuaded Englishmen that they were the allies of God in the war with His enemies.

The movements of opinion within the Church during Elizabeth's reign had more far-reaching results, more immediate and continuous influence than we could expect from the activities, however noble and disinterested, of the Catholics. The Puritan element in England was not composed of men who suffered or were proscribed. It could speak with authority and was entrenched in responsible positions, in Parliament and council chamber, in bishops' houses and cathedral chapters and benefices, in the Inns of Court and the universities. It ran through all shades of opinion, from docile submission to frank rebellion, and the line between permissible and illegal criticism was only gradually revealed. It must be regarded as an essential part of the spiritual life of the time, here glowing brightly with the sense of adventure, the passion for knowledge, the craving for

beauty in all its forms, there earnest with schemes of social improvement, or drab with controversy, but always turbulent and vivacious. It was part of the Protestantism that exulted in the exploits of Drake and pointed triumphantly to the beneficial endowments of schools and colleges, hospitals and houses of charity. 'These charitable works' exclaimed Andrew Willet at the end of his catalogue of them, 'do glisten as pearls, and the workers thereof do shine as stars amongst us, their religious acts are as the pomegranates in Aaron's priestly garment, and themselves as the tinkling bells hanging thereon, do sound abroad the praises of the Gospel'¹. Historians better acquainted than Willet was with the benefactions of the past and the social movements of his own time tell a different story, but the fact remains that religious thinkers were, in their way, sounding the depths of human nature, exploring knowledge, and casting about for the ways of improving society. They were of the time of Shakespeare and Bacon and the busy minds which framed the new Poor Law and brought new life to local government. The splendid work of Hooker sprang from the controversy with Presbyterian idealists, and the innumerable disputes about the governance of the Church were but part of the concern revealed in episcopal visitations, in archdeacons' courts, in the new organization of the parish, in preachings and pamphlets, for the social ordering of the Christian life. Beneath every expression of this activity, so often frustrated though it was by the new spirit of adventure and desire for gain, lay the belief in society as an organism, in which political and religious life worked in unison, as body with soul, under the guidance of a common head. The common law and the church law each had its appropriate place. It was the social duty of the ecclesiastical authorities to suppress usury and check greed and immorality, just as it was the social duty of the secular power to judge between man and man and to maintain order.² Episcopalian and Presbyterian

¹ The 'catalogue of good works' done in the sixty years following the accession of Elizabeth is included in the 1634 edition of Willet's *Synopsis Papismi*, pp. 1219-43.

² See especially R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1926), pp. 150-75. Some useful, though incoherent, information has been gathered together by Hans Leube in his short study *Reformation und Humanismus in England* (Leipzig, 1930).

quarrelled about the ways in which these duties were to be performed and laid the emphasis on different points, but they were agreed on the fundamental issue. And it should never be forgotten that the apostle of the congregational idea, Robert Browne, whose writings inspired the separatists, came back at last to the conviction that it was impossible to separate the secular from the spiritual power. Browne had no use for episcopal courts or Presbyterian synods or classes as agents of Christian discipline. He believed in the right and duty of each congregation to choose its own minister, and despairing of the magistrate, looked to minister and people to guide the Church in the way of God. But he did not think that this system was inconsistent with secular co-operation, or even with episcopal government. When he saw where pure separatism seemed to be tending, he fell back upon the magistrate. By 1588 he was ready to allow the magistrate control over every part of the life of the Church in its congregations. To deny the authority of bishops and magistrates is to overthrow all authority,

seeing there is no duty, law, deed, cause, question or plea which ought not to be spiritual, or is not determined by the divine and spiritual right, law, and word of God. And therefore the magistrates have power and a right of administration in all these things you named

So, as solicitous as ever for the congregation, Browne in the study of this microcosm came to very much the same conclusion as his contemporary Hooker reached after ranging over the wide fields of human experience in thought and history. He had the same feeling about law, a much weaker regard for the organized Church, and a stronger belief in the magistrate.

It is from this general standpoint that the opposition to the episcopal system and the royal supremacy should be considered. The movement is usually regarded, and very naturally, as the source of later developments. Students of politics have fastened upon it as a significant factor in the history of constitutional government and of religious toleration. It emphasized the dilemma in the Elizabethan settlement, a dilemma of which toleration and parliamentary control were to be the working

solutions Ecclesiastical historians have deplored it or rejoiced in it, as the case might be, because it destroyed the early dream of uniformity These considerations did not enter the minds of the Presbyterians and Separatists, moreover, if we take too much account of them, we may do injustice to the settlement as a whole The German scholar Troeltsch, for example, would seem to regard the English attempt to create a State Church as of little importance in comparison with the more fruitful experiments of its critics.

Most of the critics in fact were concerned, not to destroy the Anglican experiment but to develop it in their own way They thought that the old bottles could hold new wine of still cruder quality. It is true that from an early date Englishmen can be found who deliberately rejected the argument from history in ecclesiastical matters, just as some were inspired by the new political learning to deny that the State owed any allegiance to its past or to the common law. But, on the whole, the appeal to history was more emphatic in England than it was elsewhere. The serious study of English history had begun, and the sense of continuity in English history was strengthened both by the patriotic spirit and by the whole course of the Reformation from 1534. Archbishop Parker, an ardent antiquarian, wrote a book about the Church of England which was really an historical treatise. When at the beginning of her reign Elizabeth stated that the English Church had been founded by Joseph of Arimathea she was simply repeating the lessons of the antiquaries. Englishmen with no interest in history were influenced by this faith in continuity; or at the very least were not prepared to approve of innovations which were not directed by the Crown, the traditional symbol of English unity. Thus Philip Stubbs, in the second part of his outspoken *Anatomie of Abuses*, while denouncing the evils of private patronage and pleading for a more independent and better-paid parish clergy, was emphatic in his support of episcopal government. The bishops, he said, should appoint to benefices on the nomination of the churches, patronage should be abolished, and vagrant ministers repressed, but there should be no drastic change in government. Stubbs did not

believe in any divine right and had no theoretical objection to change, but his mind, so lively in the detection of evil, was guided by a regard for circumstances, by what he called common sense. ‘Seeing it is the pleasure of the prince to bestow such dignity, authority, and honour upon them (the bishops), methink any sober christians should easily tolerate the same.’ Again, he agrees that it would be a good thing to have a ‘seigniorie’ or eldership in every congregation, but he regards it as impracticable and unwise. In apostolic times it was necessary, but now the Church can be governed by kings, princes, and governors We must consider the state of the Church at this day: ‘for in the Apostles’ time, when seignories were ordained, we read not of any shires, dioceses, or precincts, where bishops and ecclesiastical magistrates might exercise their authority and government as now they do.’

In short, though at one time, between 1570 and 1590, it would probably not have been difficult for the English Government to reconstruct the ecclesiastical system on presbyterian lines—for there was a great deal of sympathy with this tendency of Puritanism—there was no hope for any movement which involved disobedience and revolution. In some ways there was little difference between the very able teacher, Thomas Cartwright, the Cambridge scholar who led the Presbyterian movement, and people like Stubbs or Becon, whose proposals for a more human and intimate local government in the Church I have already noticed. The fabric or material of their criticism was similar to his. But whereas they, regarding themselves without any reservations as citizens of a Christian community, proposed changes which seemed expedient, and kept eclectic minds, Cartwright and his friends were inspired, just as Calvin and Hooker in their different ways were inspired, by a conception of what the Church should be. They had small patience with conscientious people who caused trouble about details like vestments, though of course they agreed with their views. They did not wish to press the issue between Church and State, although Archbishop Parker, and Whitgift in his turn, naturally saw a Scottish or Genevan system, if not a great revolutionary

movement, as the outcome of their ideas. They believed in the co-operation of the magistrate and in his disciplinary functions as an independent, not as a subordinate, power. For years they 'tarried for the magistrate' and sought to have their way peaceably with the aid of Queen and Parliament. It is quite possible that, if they had been successful, the resulting system would have appeared a miserable compromise to Presbyterians elsewhere, just as the work of Cranmer and Ridley, whose position in the last years of Henry VIII's reign was very like that of Cartwright in the middle of Elizabeth's reign, did not satisfy the Continental reformers.

On the other hand, they differed from both Cranmer and Whitgift in imposing theoretical limitations upon obedience; and in the end they acted in accordance with their theory and tried to build up in secret assemblies and illicit 'classes' a system which they had hoped to see developed out of the local gatherings of clergy and the preachings tolerated in earlier years. The instincts of the Queen and bishops were justified, but that he had been forced to justify them was a far greater disappointment to Cartwright than it was to Elizabeth or Whitgift, for he was anything but a rebel.¹

In this essay I have dealt with one main theme, the development out of the old order of an ecclesiastical system which was regarded as an integral part of the structure of society. So far as I could, I have subdued the discussion of theory to the task of explaining practice. With the details of theological and liturgical controversy I have not been concerned; nor have I dwelt upon the ever present element of human tragedy. The Reformation in England had its dramatic, even its grim moments, for religion in the sixteenth century could be a very grim business, but to heighten the drama may be to obscure it.

¹ It is impossible to do justice in a brief account to the complicated story of the Presbyterian movement, and to what are known as the *classes* or local organizations, or to the relations of Cartwright with more unbalanced critics such as 'Martin Marprelate', or more thorough-going advocates of the independent church like Barrow and Greenwood, who would have been tolerated as little by Cartwright, if he had had his way, as they were by the government of Queen Elizabeth. See the valuable works of A. F. Scott Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright* (1925) and *Church and State, Political Aspects of Sixteenth-Century Puritanism* (1928).

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

History can never afford to neglect the humdrum influence upon affairs, as they unroll themselves from day to day before an unknown and unregarded future, of the instinctive sanity of the common man, holding fast to his life in the security of an old, and established, commonwealth.

THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND

By W. E. BROWN, M.A., D.D.

CONTENTS

I THE FIRST ATTEMPT	493
II THE 'ENGLISH' PARTY	497
III THE SCOTTISH OPPOSITION TO THE CHURCH	501
IV THE SECOND ATTEMPT.	524
V THE SUCCESSFUL METHOD	535
VI THE CULTURAL EFFECT	556

THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND

By W. E. BROWN

I

By the year 1540 the civil rulers in many districts of northern Europe had repudiated the authority of the bishop of Rome as the teacher of religion to their subjects. The movement had begun with the protection of those Catholic priests who refused to submit to the judgement of ecclesiastical tribunals. A second stage was reached when the civil rulers required all the clergy of their dominions to accept the new doctrines—the heresies¹—of their favourite preachers, and such modifications of worship as they advocated. The third stage was for the civil ruler publicly to repudiate the authority of the bishop of Rome, and to declare by edict what faith and worship his subjects were to accept and practise. In this way many of the States of the Empire had transformed a heresy into a schism. The change in faith and worship varied according to the locality, being greater in some than in others, but the repudiation of papal authority and the destruction of monastic life were common to all. Henry VIII of England had brought the movement to his country in its third stage. The changes of faith and worship which he introduced were among the slightest in Europe—though such slight changes found their parallels on the Continent. But he had by 1540 definitely put England into that political group which refused spiritual allegiance to the Catholic Church.

None of these changes had been made in Scotland. Some of the literature of the novel religious teaching had been imported from Germany and from England. A few Scotsmen had learnt the doctrines of one or other of the German heretics abroad and had preached it on their return. But the civil authorities had not protected them against the condemnations of the ecclesi-

¹ By 'heresy' I mean teaching which was opposed to the official doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church, by 'heretics' those who maintained such teaching to be true.

astical courts, the monarch still publicly professed his spiritual allegiance to the bishop of Rome.

In the year 1540 Henry VIII sent an envoy, Sir Ralph Sadler, to his nephew James V of Scotland. After the public reception Sadler sought and obtained a private interview with the King, and opened then the business on which he had been sent. On behalf of his royal master he suggested that James should seize the spiritual authority, abolishing the bishop of Rome's 'usurped power', and should destroy the monasteries, confiscating their wealth. The reasons he urged for these two steps were that they would result in an increase of the King's power and would make him wealthy, so that he would no longer need to keep flocks of sheep—whereby he was the commercial rival of many Englishmen.

Sadler reported King James's answer that night. It ran thus:

By my troth there are two laws, the spiritual law and the temporal. The cure of the one pertaineth to the Pope's holiness and the spirituality, the other to the King's power and the temporality. And for my part I trust I shall do my duty to God in the discharge of such things as pertain to the temporal power within my office and rule in this realm. But as for the spiritual law, in good faith we take no regard thereof, but commit that to the Pope's holiness, and other ordinary ministers of the Kirk within our realm.¹

In face of that answer Sadler turned to the suggestion to destroy the monasteries. He pleaded that they were unpatriotic and diverted national wealth from the royal treasury. The King met this with an emphatic denial and told Sadler. 'Methinks it against reason and God's law to put down the Abbeys and religious houses which have stood this many years and God's service maintained and kepted in the same'² The English envoy then urged that, so far from this being the case, they were hotbeds of every kind of vice. To this came the reply. 'Oh, God forbid that if a few be not good, for them all the rest should be destroyed. Though some be not, there be a great many good: and the good may be suffered and the evil must be reformed,

¹ *Letters and Negotiations of Sir Ralph Sadler* (Edinburgh, 1720), p. 34

² *Ibid.*, p. 39

as ye shall hear that I shall help to see it redressed in Scotland
by God's grace if I brook life '¹

So the interview ended. It was the first formal proposal made by England that Scotland should throw in its lot with those who had separated themselves from the Catholic States of Europe. It was the beginning of that development of Scottish history which reached its term by the end of the century. In this, the beginning, we are fortunate still to possess a strictly contemporary account of what was said and done. The continuous accounts of the Scottish Reformation written by Knox, Leslie, Lindsay of Pitscottie, and Buchanan can be shown to err, sometimes by the choice of the author, because of their prejudices. But for the first half of the century they are all untrustworthy, because their authors had not then a part in the actions they narrated, and because these continuous accounts were written after 1560 with the knowledge of those subsequent years in the author's mind. A revolution had occurred and obscured, as every revolution does, the actions and conditions which preceded it. There are no such difficulties in the way of using Sadler's evidence.² He wrote to the English monarch an immediate account of the business on which he was engaged. He wrote not to justify it or to obtain the support of an ignorant public, but merely to put his masters in possession of the facts. And he wrote it while moving in the world in which the words were said and the actions performed, so that there is no question of a different mentality misinterpreting an earlier age.

From Sadler's account then we may legitimately conclude that those who advocated the repudiation of papal allegiance and the destruction of monasteries thought it natural and proper to urge these steps because they would increase royal wealth and royal power. It was Sadler, certainly, who made these the most attractive reasons for the English policy, but at least they must have been present to the minds of all nobles and kings who

¹ Ibid., p. 40.

² Printed by McEwen (Edinburgh 1720), as *Letters and Negotiations of Sir Ralph Sadler*, and, more fully, edited by A. Clifford as *The state papers and letters of Sir Ralph Sadler* (Constable, Edinburgh 1809).

adopted Protestantism at that time They were not mere unforeseen accidents resulting from heresy and schism

Perhaps that is more important to the understanding of the history of the English than of the Scottish reformation For the latter James V's answers are better evidence. A Scottish king, not trained in theology, a king famed for his popularity and social virtues and vices, in a private interview, when he could safely express his real opinion without the aid or reproach of clerical advisers, gave a clear statement of the relation of Church and State above reproach by the standard of Catholic theology Later Catholic writers—from Ninian Winzet onward—accused the generation who lived in 1540 of ignorance of their faith They were looking back across the chasm which opened in 1560, and this alone makes one suspect their evidence But the testimony of Sadler puts the matter beyond doubt He was not surprised to find in a layman a clear knowledge of the Church's teaching It was a not unexpected quality among the Catholics of that age.

Of still greater importance is the King's answer with regard to monastic life We cannot now, perhaps no one ever could, describe statistically the religious life of a country either in its broader or narrower sense The good deeds and the sins of men and women are not sufficiently recorded for us. Our knowledge is only of the impression which the monastic institution made on its contemporaries. But if the recorder was in a position to know intimate details and had no interest to serve, his impressions probably corresponded with the facts James V was certainly the layman who of all others would be able to know the conditions of the monasteries of his dominions His manner of life was such that he may reasonably be taken as 'the man in the street' of his period; he was under considerable temptation to imitate his uncle, for he was ever in need of money. And he asserted of the monasteries that 'there be a great many that be good'. At least his remark shows, as indeed does his whole part in the interview, that in the year 1540 the normal opinion in Scotland was still loyal to the Catholic Church.

This conclusion is confirmed by other evidence. Five years

earlier Doctor Barlow, already a determined though secret supporter of Lutheran doctrines, had written from Scotland that there was no 'Gospel'¹ in the country. Sadler, even after James V's refusal, and though on a diplomatic mission, endeavoured to form a party amongst the younger nobles to overthrow the Church. In a subsequent letter he described optimistically the promising material he had found, but he was forced to acknowledge that for his purpose 'I see none among them to take in hand in the direction of things' because the bishops and priests were 'yet too strong for the other side'.²

II

After the death of James V in 1543 the English envoys laboured more openly to organize an Anglophil party of Scottish nobles who should be devoted to the interests of the King of England, but the operations of this party were still directed against the Catholic Church. At one time it was the murder of Cardinal Beaton that formed the subject of their negotiations; at another it was the introduction of heretical preachers into Fife; at another it was the destruction of the abbeys. Four campaigns were fought in Scotland by English armies between the years 1544 and 1549, and in each case heretical teaching followed in the wake of the destruction wrought by English arms. In these campaigns the English were assisted by some of the Scottish nobles, and the last successful campaign of 1559–60 was preceded by an agreement that success should be followed by the abolition of idolatry, i.e. of Catholic worship. It is not surprising then that some historians have looked on Scottish Protestantism as a product of English diplomacy and armies. Such a view was prevalent immediately after 1560, the year of crisis. The Protestants Knox and Buchanan, who wrote continuous accounts of the movement by which they had profited, treated the English party in Scotland as the natural ancestors of the Protestantism of which they were historians, for them the English came as defenders of the Gospel, as enemies of idolatry.

¹ The 'heretics' used 'gospel' to designate their religious teaching.

² *Letters and Negotiations of Sir Ralph Sadler*, pp. 61–2

Judgements such as these, of men who were near to the facts, are weighty. But they are not decisive in proving the real identification of the English party with anti-Catholicism, nor the knowledge of that identification in Scotland before 1560. For such proof we must go to records more strictly contemporary.

Shortly after the death of James V, Ralph Sadler tried to obtain the friendship of the new regent, the earl of Arran, for his master. But he did not attempt it on political grounds. The path to an English alliance, the cause for rejoicing on Sadler's part, was that the Governor (as the regent was entitled) was asking for heretical books. So Sadler reported on the 5th April 1543 a conversation he had had with Arran, who told him that it would be a hard matter to work a Reformation, 'for there be so many great men here, that be such papists and pharisees that unless the sin of covetise bring them to it, that is the desire of having the lands of the Abbeys, he knoweth none other mean to win them to his purpose in that behalf'.¹ Sadler did his best to encourage the anti-Catholicism of the Governor, and with some success. After a few days he was able to report that the Governor had come to the conclusion 'if there be no purgatory these foundations (the monasteries) be in vain and frustrate' and that this was 'a good ground whereon to proceed to the extirpation of these sects of monks and friars'.²

In the mind then of the chief organizer of the English party its *raison d'être* was the overthrow of the Catholic Church. But this was also the feeling of those who took part in its military successes. Their reports are scattered through the State papers of England of these years and the successes they claim are those of the destruction of Catholic institutions. In September 1545 they boasted of the burnings of the abbeys,³ in May 1546, after the murder of the cardinal, they boasted that no Mass was said. When Andrew Duddeley held Broughty Craig for the English his first request was for preachers to indoctrinate Angus and Fife with the novel doctrines.⁴ Resistance to the English party was said in 1548 to be due to the priests, and, as a result of

¹ *Letters and Negotiations of Sir Ralph Sadler*, p. 148

³ *Calendar of State Papers (Scotland)*, vol. 1, p. 56

² *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

English victories in that year, prisoners, priests and friars, were led about in halters and the country on all sides was in great fear¹

Many of these actions were so public that it was impossible for the people of Scotland not to understand the purpose of the English party. Even at the beginning of the movement Sadler gave direct testimony to the fact. He wrote in 1543 that the people 'say plainly that the only cause of my lying here is to put down the Kirk'.² At that time the attempt to destroy Catholic institutions was being made by Scotsmen. Sadler was reporting the sacking of the friaries at Dundee and elsewhere. But he also reported how unpopular these acts were. The provost of Edinburgh, he wrote, could not resist the fury of the people against him, and in consequence 'neither I nor my folks dare go out of doors'.³

The unpopularity of the early actions of the anti-Catholic nobles was not likely to be diminished by the English armies which carried out faithfully the spirit of the orders given to the earl of Hertford in 1544 'burn Edinburgh . . . sack Holyrood and as many towns and villages about Edinburgh as ye may conveniently Sack Leith and burn and subvert it and all the rest, putting men, women, and children to fire and sword without exception where any resistance shall be made to you'.⁴

It is easy to understand why in these circumstances the populace was sometimes infuriated against the early preachers of heresy. John Knox relates that the people of Haddington would not listen to George Wishart and that Robert Lambe nearly lost his life at Perth for attacking devotion to the saints. Both sermons were preached within a few months of the invasion of the Earl of Hertford. To the men of that time the preachers of heresy appeared as the allies and chaplains of an armed group of nobles, the friends of England, who had seized the churches in which these unlicensed clergy attacked the doctrines they had been ordained to teach.

¹ *Calendar of State Papers (Scotland)*, vol 1, p 80, and *Calendar of Scottish Papers*, vol 1, p 82

² *Hamilton Papers* (edited by Jos Bain 1890-2), vol 11, p 20

³ *Ibid*, p 21

⁴ *Ibid*, p 326

It is true to say that the law of the land before 1560 protected the Catholic religion. But the facts of the time showed that force was often on the side of the new preachers. Long before 1560 Protestantism was in power for short periods in different parts of Scotland, and Scotsmen did not forget the sword which Knox carried before George Wishart.

Experience of the work of the anti-Catholic party appears to have enraged the people against the Anglophiles with whom they were identified. It was so in 1543, as Sadler recorded. It was so again when Cardinal Beaton was imprisoned by Arran and his friends. Sir George Douglas boasted that though the cardinal 'had been much sued for, we have kept him in, maugre their hearts'.¹ His deliverance and return to power was to Buchanan, looking back over forty years, a *vix credibilis mutatio rerum Scoticarum*, but he had not seen Sadler's correspondence. The same dislike of the anti-Catholic nobles was evident in Edinburgh down to the very year of their success. Knox, who was present with their army, saw that army driven from the capital and found it hard to believe his eyes that 'our natural countrymen should so rejoice in our discomfiture'.

The strictly contemporary evidence then shows that the anti-Catholic movement was inaugurated and encouraged by the English governments of Henry VIII and Edward VI, so that, in the minds of the people of Scotland, the English party and the anti-Catholic party were then identical. Equally it shows that this party was unpopular precisely because it attacked and attempted to destroy the institutions of the Catholic Church. Now the party which in 1560 secured a quasi-legal repudiation of the Catholic religion was also supported by the English government of Elizabeth and by an English army. I have quoted one instance where its chief preacher recorded, only a few months before its military success, its unpopularity with the people of Edinburgh. It seems obvious therefore to treat the movement of 1560 as the second phase of the work of the earlier English party. Still we must avoid an easy acceptance of continuity between the two phases. The second clearly began

¹ *Letters and Negotiations of Sir Ralph Sadler*, p. 71.

when a group of Scottish nobles bound themselves by oath—perhaps we should say conspired—in 1557 to ‘destroy idolatry’ in Scotland. In that year the government of England was Catholic and the Scottish nobles could not then have known that a religious revolution would be effected within a couple of years in the southern kingdom. At least, then, we must say that the later phase was Scottish in origin. It may still have been as unpopular as the first—to decide that question we shall have to examine the evidence of the growth of the movement. Its originators were certainly the remnants of the old ‘English’ anti-Catholic party of nobles, but they expected to get a following in Scotland apart from English help in money or in arms. We must therefore inquire what conditions and what actions in Scotland would drive men into their camp. And since their conspiracy was directed against the Catholic Church we must consider the actions of the Church, of the *sacerdotium* of that generation.

III

The great difficulty of historiography is that names and institutions have survived from earlier times while the common attitude of mind to them has changed. The difficulty is particularly present in all that concerns the Catholic Church. At least in English-speaking countries men are accustomed to think of the Catholic religion as one amongst several proposed for their acceptance, and of the Catholic Church as one teacher of faith, morals, and worship amongst others making similar claims. It is difficult to remember that such was not the attitude of mind common to the generation of James V of Scotland. To recapture the older conditions it is not enough to say that in every village and town of Scotland Mass was said, the Pope was prayed for, the Sacraments were administered and Catholic doctrines taught, and that there was not any rival organization possessing buildings set apart for a different worship. The Catholic Church was seen then as a social and juridical order independent of, though intertwined with, the civil order which nominally at least depended on the monarch. The Catholic Church provided

the song schools and grammar schools of the villages and towns, and the three universities of the country. These were not indeed exclusively (the schools not even mainly) for those who were to be churchmen in the strict sense of the word. Nor in the case of the schools were the buildings always the property of the Church. But the standards of moral instruction and the teachers were given by the Church and were subject only to the supervision of the Church. Instruction as a form of social activity was ecclesiastical. But so also were many other social activities. If a man was cheated of succession to his father's estate, if he wanted protection from an usurious contract, if he wanted his irregular marriage validated or sought a decree of nullity, it was in the courts of the Church that he sought redress. Nor did the Church carry on this task by delegation or concession from the State. The appointment of her judges, the principles by which they acted, were not determined by the State, but ultimately by an authority understood as external to Scotland. The man who sought redress in these matters, as the man who sought education for his children, went to the Church not because the State had made a law bidding or enabling the Church so to act, but because the Church's claim and the custom of accepting it was as old and well established as the claim of the civil order of society to a man's allegiance.

The distinction made between the two by James V was, as Sadler reports, that 'there are two laws, the spiritual and the temporal'. But it would be an error to think of the spiritual, as contemporary language inclines to do, as concerned solely with the interior acts of a man, while his exterior actions were governed by the temporal. The spiritual order, wherein the Church was sole legislator, judge, and ruler, was every whit as concrete, imposing, vigorous, and detailed as the order which depended from the King. That character was symbolized by, and perhaps depended on, the source of the Church's wealth. The latter did not come from the voluntary alms of the faithful or from a grant by the State. The Church was essentially an endowed institution, supported by its own personal and private property. The great ecclesiastical institutions, the bishoprics,

the monasteries, the parishes had each its own estate, large or small. Their titles were as old, and therefore as legitimate, as those by which the monarchs and the nobles held their lands. And the use which abbot or bishop made of his lands was controlled by the law of the Church, determined with authority by the legislators of the Church.

While these facts serve as a reminder that the Catholic Church was accepted as a matter of course by Scotsmen at large, it must not be supposed that spiritual authority was a mere matter of ancient custom. Laymen were generous, even in the sixteenth century and within a few years of the repudiation of the authority of the Catholic Church, in gifts which would develop the influence of the Church on the people at large. They still gave great estates for the founding of collegiate churches, they still left money for Masses to be said in perpetuity for their souls, they still co-operated with the clergy in founding colleges and universities.

A correct picture of the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century would show that it was a normal part of the order of society, not only by tradition but also in daily action. To find some counterpart in modern life to its activity and influence we should perhaps have to liken it to national life of to-day. A man accepted it as he accepts to-day his nationality, he took part in its life as he takes part in national life to-day, he criticized it without intending to destroy it, as he does to-day in regard to his nation. Of course, it must be added that the parallel should not be pressed too far. A man of the sixteenth century knew that the Church taught a religion, that its authority rested on its claim to be of divine origin, that its chief business was the faith and the sacraments, that, in short, the Church was not the nation. Even here, however, there had been some confusion. The circumstances of the fourteenth century had led many in Europe to regard the Church as the association of Catholic nations. Consequently each nation had thought that it should as a unit give its allegiance to the Pope as head of the Church. On the two or three occasions in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries when there had been question of deciding between two claimants to Papal authority, Scotland had decided as a

unit—king, bishops, and people making a joint submission. So also in matters of ecclesiastical moment, the safeguarding of the faith, the delimitation of the frontiers of civil and ecclesiastical law, the bishops had acted not separately as rulers of the Church but jointly with the monarch and the nobles. If we were dealing with the fifteenth century it would be unhistoric to insist strongly on the distinction in men's minds between civil and spiritual jurisdiction. But the efforts of the Popes in the latter half of that century had not been without effect in restoring the older concepts. At least in Scotland, as is shown by James V's reply to Sadler, the distinction was again clearly recognized.

The earlier confusion had survived in at least two departments—those of the appointment of ecclesiastics and of national finance. Because of the power of the Church it was readily recognized that the monarch had a legitimate interest in the qualities of those appointed to ecclesiastical authority. It had therefore become common for nominations to bishoprics to be made by the Pope only after hearing the King's wishes, and often according to his recommendations. In this way, for the sake of friendly relations between Church and State, the episcopate was almost entirely filled by those who had been employed in the service of the Crown, and who continued after their appointment to be largely occupied in the business of the secular state.

The second department concerned the national revenue. The imposing character of the spiritual order was as noticeable in Scotland as elsewhere in Christendom by the extent of its endowments. For purposes of taxation the Church lands were assessed at half the total contribution of the nation. This amazing wealth was largely due to their productiveness; they were richer for their extent than the generality of the lay lands. It was no doubt a natural increase due to the fact that Church lands were administered by trained men, and suffered less frequently than lay lands from the incidence of war. The title of the Church to this wealth was as ancient and as sound as that of any other property in Scotland. Nevertheless it gave churchmen the appearance of being an exceedingly wealthy body, and it called for prelates

who were good administrators and politicians, qualities not always found amongst the devout. There was and is a theoretical question as to whether this wealth was or was not beneficial to the Church. In practice, however, the wealth of the Church was largely used for national purposes. The Stuart kings, with the consent or at least the tolerance of the Popes, had found means of laicizing the superfluous wealth of the Church. Partly this was effected by appointing to the sees those who were able to discharge civil duties. More directly it was effected by the system of commendatory abbots. A great part of the Church's wealth lay in the abbey lands. A system had been developed by which the King was allowed to nominate to abbeys and priories his relatives and his servants, men who were not members of the orders to whom the lands belonged. While a sufficient part of the revenues were reserved to the brethren, the rest were possessed for life by the abbot *in commendam*, and so the servants of the civil government were rewarded.

It is absurd to talk, as some have done, as though these commendators were always, or even usually, men of evil lives. Some of them were excellent as statesmen, others as men of letters, a few were or became devoted to the real work of the abbeys over which they ruled. The system, however, was clearly open to grave abuses, and many Popes had entered a protest against its continuance. Naturally enough the monarchs and the nobles were not anxious to see it abolished. For them it provided a means of laicizing the superfluous wealth of the Church without any infringement of the right of private property.

In addition to these means of nationalizing ecclesiastical revenues there were direct payments to the State. The heaviest burdens of taxation were borne again and again by the Church. Neither Pope nor bishops made other than formal protests against the practice, since they recognized the interest of the Church in supporting a stable and powerful secular government. The grants made to the King were made in Scotland with the consent of the Pope and paid as willingly as taxes ever are paid. But such payments required the raising of ready money on Church property, and were secured again and again by

transferring it on long leases or in feu to a noble who was able to supply the money. The process was imitated whenever an ecclesiastical corporation found itself in need of money. As a result a large part of the Church lands ceased to be administered by their ecclesiastical owners, who thereby lost immediate contact with their nominal tenants. In many places, therefore, the monasteries were no longer able to influence the social welfare of those who lived on their lands, while they remained collectors of tithes and other duties—a position dangerous to their popularity. For the moment, however, the practice, like the appointment of commendatory abbots, saved the Church from being an object of envy to king or nobles, who could scarcely assert that the Church monopolized the wealth which it owned. In the long run, however, this very advantage led to worse evils, since the gratification of an instinct is more likely to increase than to 'sublimate' its force. The taste for ecclesiastical wealth was acquired in the fifteenth century by the nobles, and it did not require greater wit than Arran possessed to see that 'the sin of covetise' might bring the nobles to effect a change which would put all ecclesiastical wealth at their disposal.

Those, then, who by Sadler's advice and under his direction set themselves in the years A.D. 1540–60 to repudiate the authority of the Catholic Church were attempting to alter the whole structure of society in Scotland. They were in much the same position as a man would be to-day who sought to alter the national life in its methods of guaranteeing liberty and order, and in its distribution of the rights of property. But because the Church was so closely intertwined with the social order men could enter on the path of revolution from many avenues, and might not understand where that path was leading. Some would think of it indeed as a repudiation of the principles of the religion on which Scotland had been formed. Denying the merit of good works they would want to see the abolition of the whole Catholic complex of organized charity, its schools, its monasteries, its churches. Most of them would soon realize, for the development of Protestantism abroad had always taken this line, that such an attack involved repudiating the sacramental

teaching of the Church, and therefore of the Mass. Others again would be content with the work of Henry VIII of England. They would want to see the Catholic organization made subject to the civil power while leaving its juridical work untouched. In effect their plan would be to exalt the lay nobility at the expense of the higher ecclesiastics. But as the negotiations of Sadler indicate, the Scots nobles of this party were also ready to imitate the programme of England by the confiscation, for the benefit of the lay nobles, of the monastic estates and of other ecclesiastical foundations. Such men, like the followers of German Protestantism, would be driven to repudiate that spiritual authority which the Catholic Church claimed and which, as James V's answer to Sadler showed, was so well understood in Scotland. And because of that denial they would easily become bitter enemies of the Sacrament of the Altar, and of the Mass which embodied Catholic worship. While these remained the obedience which the people paid to the Church would also remain, and it would be difficult to repudiate the Church's authority. But at first there might be many who would agree to a lay control of the Church while retaining their belief in the Church's doctrine.

The motives for which men can desire a change in the civilization by which they have been formed are largely a matter of speculation. It is a more restricted and manageable inquiry to find out what conditions in the Church and what actions of the *sacerdotium* led some Scotsmen to throw in their lot with the English party in the years 1540–60. It is usual to answer that the literary evidence of the time shows that men thought of their priests as unlearned, depraved, and avaricious, and that, disgusted by such conditions, many supported the attack without perhaps intending the final overthrow. In this connexion the reference to Sir John Latinless in Lyndsay's *Kitteris Confessioun* and the characters of the prelates in the same author's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* are generally cited. These works can scarcely be called Protestant in doctrine. The *Satyre* was acted indeed before the courts of James V and Mary of Lorraine (Mary of Guise), whose orthodoxy was above reproach. Some of the later

versions (there is none extant of a date prior to 1560) contain a few verses urging one or other of the 'reforms'—but these fit in badly with the bulk of the work, which assumes a Catholic background. It is easy, too, to exaggerate the attack which this satire makes on the clergy 'Deceit' and his companions are not represented as friars, but disguised as friars so as to be more readily heard—testimony maybe to the moral influence of the preaching orders which had no position of authority in the Church. The evil-living prioress, being detected in vice, throws off her habit to seek a husband—which was precisely the charge made by the orthodox against the sixteenth-century heretics. Nevertheless Lyndsay does represent the prelates as unwilling to accept 'Correction' even when the King, the nobles, and the merchants express their good resolutions.

The difficulty of using this as historical evidence lies first in its nature. It is satire, and so may be either the exaggeration of occasional defects or the representation of general ones. There would be precisely the same difficulty in arguing from post-war drama to the characteristics of the wealthy in Britain to-day. Lyndsay shows us that some of his class, i.e. of the Court, were ready to accept his picture of the prelates, and that it was true of some of the clergy,¹ but the historical information we want, the extent of the fact or even of the opinion, cannot be obtained from a satire.

But there is another and greater difficulty in using this evidence. It is extremely meagre in quantity. Of literary work there is, beside Lyndsay's work, the *Complaynt of Scotland* written in the middle of the century and some ballads which enshrine the novel doctrines of the time. The latter group shows that in Scotland as elsewhere—and many of these ballads were based on German songs—the Protestants taught their doctrines by ballad as well as by sermon. The *Complaynt of Scotland*, being a jeremiad rather than a satire, may represent a more widely held opinion, but it was not in any sense anti-Catholic. If we widen the scope to include works which were in circulation as

¹ This follows from the contemporary letter printed with the text of the *Satyre* by the *Scottish Text Society*.

well as those which were written in the period, we should include Dunbar's poetry—but Dunbar died a fervent Catholic His satirical references—and Lyndsay's, too, for that matter—could be paralleled in any century from the twelfth onward and are not therefore necessarily evidence of growing dissatisfaction with the clergy And if we include Dunbar we must also include the lives of the Saints and the books of Catholic prayers for Mass and Vespers which were printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries The same canon which would make us believe that a description of wicked prelates showed general corruption amongst churchmen would lead us to deduce saintliness because of the frequent appearance of churchmen in the lives of the Saints

While Lyndsay's *Satyre* and *Kitteis Confessioun* were written for the enjoyment of the small class of educated men, they probably repeat accusations made by orthodox preachers throughout the preceding centuries. The denunciation of the vices of every class of society was probably a common mediaeval sermon-theme in Scotland, as it certainly was in England It shows indeed that the orthodox preachers were never silent on the moral failures of prince and peasant, of priest and merchant and noble But just because the criticisms were directed against every class and because they were traditional, they are not evidence of a growing dissatisfaction with the lives of a particular class.

While the literature, then, is not such as to show the extent of ignorance, vice, and avarice amongst the clergy, nor of the effect of these on the minds of the people, it does show that these were regarded as ecclesiastical defects at the time From it we pass to other evidence to find out the extent and the effect of these failings.

The accusation of ignorance must be set against the background of the work which the Church was doing for culture and education. The grammar schools of the towns were, in all the cases which can be verified, in the hands of priests. At Dundee and Haddington they had been placed by the citizens under the Conventual Friars, because the citizens looked for a better education from them. Those arrangements, made in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, continued down to the expulsion of the religious. The universities—there were three in Scotland

—were staffed by the clergy, and they had in the sixteenth century at least one scholar of European reputation. Nor were they stagnant institutions. In the first half of the sixteenth century a new college had been founded and enlarged in St Andrews and the whole of that work was ecclesiastical. The monasteries in some dioceses were sending selected monks to receive their training at the university. In others, such as Melrose, there had been priors known for their interest in the more modern studies pursued in Italy, at Kinloss the abbot Robert Reid and his friend, the Italian Ferrari, were collecting a fine library even down to the destruction of the monastery. It must not be forgotten that a man of the sixteenth century saw all these as ecclesiastical institutions, and with this knowledge he formed his judgement on the learning of the clergy. Again, it should not be forgotten that the subjects of general culture have changed since that time. The great exercise of medieval intelligence was in the principles of law. Every diocese of Scotland had its officials learned in that science. They were ecclesiastics, and their knowledge and skill must be taken into account when we form an estimate of the impression made on laymen by the *sacerdotium* of the sixteenth century.

Nor were such men to be found only in the ranks of the 'higher clergy'—if, indeed, the implied distinction was clear at that time. When the revolution comes the defenders of orthodoxy—men like Ninian Winzet—surprise by their wide knowledge of the Fathers, their readiness of quotation, their skill in argumentation, even when writing hurriedly and without facility of references. Yet Ninian Winzet was not more than the master of a small grammar school, and was not esteemed more learned than men like Maxwell, Cunningham, Black, Dury, and Kennedy. They had all received their education from ecclesiastical institutions of the previous half-century.

It is against such a background that the positive evidence of ignorance must be set. Some of it is merely a matter of phraseology. The heretics of the sixteenth century described as ignorance every refusal to accept their theory of salvation by faith alone. They held that the doctrine was so clearly contained in the

epistles of Saint Paul that those who followed the older exegesis were lacking in knowledge either of the text or of God's revelation. Such an accusation is, of course, only the statement of doctrinal opinion and is not, in the modern sense, evidence of ignorance. The frequency of the phrase 'ignorant shavelings' in this connexion does not prove lack of learning any more than the sister phrase 'priests of Baal' proves the clergy to have revived the rites of the Philistines.

There remains more serious evidence. At a meeting in the middle of the century the bishops of Scotland declared that one of the causes of heresy was the 'crass ignorance of literature and of all the liberal arts' to be found in churchmen of almost all ranks. It is of course true that episcopal councils do not record their approbation of existing conditions, but seek to remedy the imperfections of their clergy and people. For this reason lamentations such as this can be traced back at least to the time of St Jerome. But it was in the sixteenth century, as in earlier times, good evidence that the scholars among the clergy, to be found in every rank, found also among their fellows men who were entirely without scholarship. No statistical account is now available, but it is easy to measure the effect on laymen in general. The only method by which the bishops could provide a remedy for the existing ignorance was by strengthening and using the existing ecclesiastical institutions of monasteries, schools, universities. The only standard to which the ignorant clergy could be raised was that of the learned and orthodox clergy. If the clergy remained ignorant it was not because they were too orthodox, too observant of the discipline of the Church, but because they did not make sufficient use of ecclesiastical institutions and were not duly obedient to the constituted authorities of the Church. So it was that the later orthodox writers complained that the heretics were ignorant of the Fathers and the findings of Councils, of history, and of theology. So it was that in the heresy trials the accusation was of deluding simple men. So it was that the bishops insisted that inquisitors of heresy must be learned. And this explains another phrase of the bishops. They referred in their council to the 'crass

ignorance of the clergy' as an occasion of heresy. Nowadays it is often assumed that this means that men revolted from the Church because they were shocked by this ignorance. But to form a contemporary view we must remember that this ignorance showed a neglect to obey Church law. The men of the sixteenth century never forgot that religion was a thing to be learned and not to be selected. An ignorant priest taught or was likely to teach false religion, and so became an occasion for heresy. The bishops, in fact, were accusing the novel doctrines of being the fancies of unlearned priests.

Although it cannot be assumed that Scotsmen generally held the same opinion, it is certain that in the normal sense of the word learning was not and could not be claimed as a special quality of the preachers of the English party. In fact, neither Hamilton nor Wishart nor Methuen nor Miln nor Knox have left any evidence of learning of the same order as that of John Major, or Ninian Winzet, or Quentin Kennedy. The learned who afterwards decorated the Protestant party, Wynram and Buchanan, did not join it till after its military success. In the years 1540-60 it did not gain adherents on account of its greater culture.

There is more detailed evidence of the neglect of clerical celibacy than of ignorance.

By canon law the sub-diaconate and *a fortiori* subsequent orders in the Church formed a diriment impediment to marriage. Similarly a perpetual vow of 'religion' made it impossible for man or woman validly to contract matrimony. At the same time the canon law of the Church imposed on all sub-deacons and those of higher orders the obligation of perfect and perpetual chastity. Clerics who had not been raised to the sub-diaconate did not undertake such an obligation, but they lost their clerical status by marriage. It is clear, then, that the Church demanded from her ministers a more difficult standard of chastity than she demanded from the faithful laity. But failure to observe this standard meant for those who had received the sub-diaconate the sin of fornication, and, even though such men lived like a married clergy, this remained true, and their children were

bastards. Equally if a cleric in minor orders hoped or intended later on in life to receive priestly or episcopal rank—and many benefices demanded such rank of the holder—he must deny himself marriage.

In the Register of the Privy Seal are recorded the acts of legitimation of bastard children, and some of these are specifically the children of clerics. Even if we take the figure arrived at by the late Dr Hay Fleming there would not be more than 600 such bastards during the thirty years preceding 1560.¹ In many cases there is no reason to suppose that the fathers were already in major orders, or even in minor orders, when the children were conceived; even in the sixteenth century itself the Catholic writers defended the memory of Cardinal Beaton—whose children were among the legitimated—on the ground that his illegal union terminated before he received the priesthood. But by any computation this number would not represent more than one in a hundred of the clergy as living in concubinage.

While these figures are a warning against general statements concerning the corruption of the clergy, it must also be said that they do not by themselves represent the full effect of the scandal. Owing to the method of appointment to the episcopate those who filled the sees were men who had been for long years in the service of the State, clerics usually but not sub-deacons or priests, with the alternative of laicization and marriage continually before their eyes. It is scarcely surprising that these men had often founded bastard families before their consecration as bishops—but it was not a healthy state of mind which could view such promotion in the Church as normal. The same must also be said of the abbots *in commendam* who, while holding those positions of authority, were often dispensed from receiving major orders, though by marriage they would forfeit their position and revenues.

In estimating the effect of this state of affairs on the growth

¹ Hay Fleming *Lectures on the Reformation in Scotland*, appendix (London 1910). Dr Hay Fleming's method almost certainly exaggerates the number. He has taken those with the prefix *Dominus* to be clerics, though it is true that *Dominus* was usually applied to beneficed priests who were not graduates; it was certainly not reserved for priests. Even the title *Capellarus* is not certain evidence of priestly orders, cf. *Hist MSS Comm*, 10th Rep., Part I, p. 73, no. 47.

of the anti-Catholic party in Scotland the opposed attitudes must be taken into consideration. The official and public utterances of ecclesiastical authority condemned the practice or toleration of clerical concubinage. Not only was it contrary to the known law of the Church, but by specific declarations of the bishops in provincial councils it was declared to be a vile sin against which the sternest measures ought to be taken. On the other hand, all the preachers of heresy and their supporters against whom the ecclesiastical authorities took action during this period were in theory and practice opponents of clerical celibacy. They not only maintained that the Church law was contrary to Divine law, but that it was impossible to observe it, and therefore that it was allowable and even praiseworthy that a priest should, in the phrase of one of them, 'marry and copulate', which in the then state of society was equivalent to advocating clerical concubinage. This was one of the specific charges made against Sir John Borthwick in the only heresy case of the period of which we have an authentic account. But if we may accept the later and dubious accounts published long afterwards by Knox and Buchanan, the same charge entered into other cases. So also in practice Methven and Wishart had persuaded the Franciscan nuns of Fife to live with them in concubinage; Miln had been so living for years before his trial. No less than Cardinal Beaton or Archbishop Hamilton these men had broken canon law—the only law of marriage—and were guilty therefore of concubinage. The difference was that while Beaton and Hamilton admitted that their acts were against the law, the preachers wanted the law to be destroyed, and acted as though it were destroyed. To the men of the sixteenth century then the party of novel doctrines, of English and anti-Catholic sympathies, did not appear as a party of better moral tone, at least on the score of clerical chastity, than the orthodox personnel of the Church.

In fact, the evidence would lead to a further conclusion for this period. Many of the heretic preachers were priests of the Church and used their priestly authority to teach the doctrines they had adopted. But all of them of whom notice has survived

had abandoned the ideal and practice of clerical celibacy. According to Dr. Hay Fleming, there was an increase in the number of legitimations during this period when the novel doctrines were being spread now in one part of Scotland, now in another. The special evidence relating to religious houses leaves the same impression. In 1540 James V, who was in a position to know, had declared that a few only of the monasteries were not good, and his statement was in answer to a specific charge of unchastity. In 1556 a report was made to Cardinal Sermoneta in Rome on the condition of the Church in Scotland,¹ and it declared that in the previous ten years monks and nuns had turned aside to business and lechery, that they had ignored their vows, and were living in concubinage. It was precisely then in the period of the armed attacks of the anti-Catholic party that these breaches of the canon law took place. The successes of that party meant that for that time and place the Reformation was already established. If we may judge by what happened after their more general success in 1560, their early acts would be directed to persuading or even compelling priests and religious to abandon celibacy, since such an action ensured their acceptance of the 'reform'. In Fife, at least, this was what took place in 1543. But even if there was no compulsion, the mere destruction of monastic houses and the accompanying expulsion of the Church Courts of Justice, which was always a feature of the success of the Protestants, meant that the Catholic discipline could no longer be applied. The orthodox claimed that celibate chastity could be observed only with the aid of the sacraments and with the discipline which the clergy and religious had voluntarily accepted. No psychologist would claim that less than this could ensure celibate chastity for a large number of men and women. Naturally therefore the successes at which the anti-Catholic party aimed, and which they sometimes achieved, caused an increase of clerical concubinage.

The facts, then, do not suggest that the anti-Catholic party grew by the disgust of laymen at seeing the Church's law broken

¹ Printed in *Papal Negotiations of Queen Mary*, edited for the Scottish History Society, vol 37, by the Rev A H Pollen, S J

even by clergy of high rank. Nor indeed is there evidence that the expression of such disgust was treated as heresy or even as anticlericalism. Some of the heretical preachers, if we can trust the much later accounts of Knox and Buchanan, gibed at their judges for practising the evil which the heretics were sentenced for upholding. But it must be remembered that only in one case has there survived an authentic and contemporary account of a heresy trial in Scotland of these years. In the process of 1561, as the result of which John Borthwick was declared not to have been guilty of heresy, the record of the trial held twenty years earlier was given in full. There had been no question of accusations against the clergy forming the basis of a charge of heresy. So far as the latter turned on the matter of celibacy, it was that Borthwick had taught that clerical celibacy was wrong. The only case where, according to Knox, disciplinary action was taken because of accusations against the clergy was that of William Arth the Dominican, who, if Knox is to be believed, was guilty of slander. Arth, however, was no heretic and was indeed imprisoned later by Henry VIII for maintaining the authority of the Pope.

Desire to gauge the mood of the people at large in any historical development has led to the suggestion that the strength of the anti-Catholic movement was increased by the heresy trials. So to think is to read into the sixteenth century the psychology of the nineteenth. The mere fact that the Church was then part of the national social order, and that the suppression of heresy was a defence of that order, makes the explanation unlikely, and the historical facts confirm such a judgement. When Buchanan wrote his account of the period he claimed that the execution of George Wishart for heresy in 1545 led to an increase of those who were opposed to the Church. So far, however, from holding that this was a reaction from the severity displayed by Cardinal Beaton, Buchanan claimed that it was due to the fulfilment of prophecies made by Wishart before his execution. The 'prophecies' were little else than a promise of vengeance—certainly already plotted by Wishart's friends, with the aid of Henry of England—and, if there was any reaction against a

'persecuting' Church, it was strange that Buchanan should ignore it for a less obvious explanation. Further, the theory of a people disgusted by 'heresy hunts' is contrary to the history of the development of the anti-Catholic party in Scotland. Cardinal Beaton set himself, before and after the death of James V, to apply the heresy laws in all their strictness. Yet Cardinal Beaton was so popular that, according to his enemy Sir George Douglas, he was kept in prison by Arran 'maugre the hearts of the people'. After Beaton's murder the bishops did not, according to Buchanan, seek for the blood of the preachers of novel doctrines. Yet it was precisely in this period, when the heresy laws were not enforced as before, that heresy grew.

The mere accident that incidents of a period of twenty years are thrown together in an historical survey leads easily to the mistaken assumption that they were so present to men and women living through those twenty years. Heresy trials which terminated in an execution were extremely rare in Scotland. After Beaton's death they could be counted on the fingers of one hand. It was not, then, from these that men would form their attitude of mind towards an institution like the Church, which entered so intimately and frequently into their daily life.

Besides the evidence already considered, which of itself leads only to tentative conclusions, there is one important group that helps us to determine the extent to which men in sixteenth-century Scotland identified the work of the Church with the scandals of ignorance and vice. It is the evidence of the public and officially expressed attitude of the Church.

The importance of this evidence is the greater because Scotsmen in the sixteenth century were normally within the Church. They were not aliens who had to generalize from the individual clergy or Catholics they met, but were themselves members of this institution, to whom its attitude of mind would normally be communicated. Fortunately there is abundant evidence of what the attitude of the Church in Scotland was. Four times at least in the ten years following 1549 the Church in Scotland in its corporate capacity declared its mind. Councils which were attended by bishops and priests, monks and friars, and

by nobles who attended in their quality of commendatory abbots and priors, dealt with the scandals amongst churchmen, and the records of their decisions have survived.

The canons¹ which they decreed fall naturally into three groups. Of these the first was directed to secure throughout the country an understanding of the doctrines of the Church and especially of those which were being impugned. The bishops ordered a minimum number of sermons to be preached every year in the parish churches. They commissioned the preparation of a simple but theologically exact and literary statement of Christian doctrine in the vernacular. This was to be issued to the clergy, who were to read portions of it to their flock after such preparation as would ensure that its reading should be not only intelligible but rhetorical. In order that provision should be made for such teaching to be better carried on, the councils decreed that every monastery and diocese should devote part of its manpower and income to the training of future preachers in the universities. The numbers to be supplied and the benefices to be set aside for this purpose were enumerated in the conciliar decrees. As a corollary to these efforts to improve the teaching efficiency of the Church, the ordinaries were commanded to appoint learned inquisitors to examine their clergy, and to deprive of their licences and their benefices all those who taught contrary to the doctrine of the Church which commissioned them.

The second group of canons was devised to enforce the laws of clerical conduct. At first the decrees of the Council of Basle were re-enacted. Priests who were notorious offenders against celibacy were to be deprived of the fruits of their benefices for three months, and if this did not bring them to obedience were to suffer the perpetual loss of all emoluments. Suspension and excommunication and fines were the sentences to be inflicted on those who besmirched the clerical state by engaging in trade or by wearing secular dress. Later decrees of the councils completed and made more severe the system of penalties for such offences and decreed an inquisitorial visitation to discover

¹ Printed in *Statutes of the Scottish Church*, edited for the Scottish History Society (1907) by Dr Patrick.

offenders. At the last of the councils of this period the power of the inquisitors was extended to cover inquiry into the lives of the bishops themselves.

The purpose of the third group of enactments was obviously to disentangle the social from the sacramental side of ecclesiastical life. The very richness of development of Catholic action and the antiquity of the Church had made it as necessary a part of society as the civil institutions. Consequently it had become part of the economic system and juridical order of society. Its endowment was partly in teinds, just as its work was partly to rule matters of testament, legitimization, and marriage according to scientific principles. The sanction for its decisions was primarily its power of excommunication—it could cut off the offender against social order from the sacraments. The system was theoretically justifiable because the offender against social order is ultimately an offender against morality; unfortunately the sixteenth-century Scot, like mankind in general, found it hard to understand that his particular quarrel with the economic and social system was fundamentally immoral. Even in the satirical literature against the clergy there is no charge that the clergy claimed more than their legal rights, or even that they used the law to extend those rights. But, since payment of taxes seems always a burden, it became a scandal when the parson cursed for the non-payment of teinds, and above all when the Easter Sacraments were refused to a man who would not pay his teinds in full. The councils sought to find a remedy, without sacrificing the endowments of the Church, by urging the legal settlement of all disputes on the subject long before the approach of Easter. So, too, they introduced remedies into the processes of the ecclesiastical courts, to make them less tedious and less expensive. But the most important of their economic decrees was that first made in 1549, and repeated ten years later, by which the clergy were forbidden to let the Church glebe in feu farm, or emphyteusis, or even for leases of nineteen years or over, except to those who were actually tilling the soil. If that rule had been in force from the fifteenth century, the Church could never have lost direct contact with those who

tilled the Church lands, would never have appeared as a remote rent-collector, giving nothing to her tenants in return for their payments

It has frequently been remarked that the canons of these provincial councils, repeated several times during the ten years which preceded 1560, are good evidence of the existence of scandals amongst sixteenth-century churchmen. Undoubtedly they are such, but they are evidence of much more. Had the conditions of ignorance, concubinage, and avarice been universal or even generally tolerated, it would have been impossible for the assemblies of prelates and higher clergy to condemn them so vigorously and enact such detailed methods for their cure. But the most important historical evidence the councils afford is that they show what the known public mind of the Church was during these years. They were not the mere lamentations of worthy men grieved at the decay of morals, but were the public act of a widespread powerful organization. The decrees were published in a wider sense than any of the literary works of the period, for they were proclaimed in every diocese of the land. No Scotsman was allowed to remain ignorant that the Church regarded the ignorant or the lewd or the avaricious priest as its enemy.

Nor were these canons merely hortatory. They were the work of a legislative body and became after enactment part of the law enforceable by the courts of the Church. Even in the few years before the military success of the anti-Catholic party some of them became effective. The 'plain and easy statement and explanation of the rudiments of the faith' was prepared and issued, and is a tribute to the standard of scholarship of the Scottish clergy.¹ The learning of the clergy who defended the Catholic religion after 1560 is evidence that in the last ten years of her power the theological education afforded by the Church in Scotland was far from contemptible.

The time during which these reforming decrees were operative—and of course whenever and wherever the anti-Catholic party

¹ Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism. The most convenient edition is that of Dr. Paterson (Edin. 1882).

was powerful they were ignored—was too short to allow an estimate of their worth by results To measure their wisdom it must be recalled that they were consciously and expressly an application to Scotland of the decrees of the early sessions of the great Council of Trent Indeed it could be claimed that the Scottish hierarchy, whatever their faults, showed themselves more ready than their brethren in other lands to respond to the call of the Catholic reformers Elsewhere it was ten, twenty years, sometimes a generation, before the Tridentine Laws were adopted by detailed provincial legislation The decrees of the Scottish bishops were made less than three years after the discussions at Trent The reforms, then, which these four provincial councils of the Scottish Church introduced were those which did in fact remove the scandals of sixteenth-century Catholic life in all the countries of Europe Given time to operate, they were efficient to raise the standards of churchmen. But their immediate effect on Scotland was not to diminish the bitterness or violence of the anti-Catholic party The efforts made by the latter in the second phase, i e from the year 1557 onwards, were stronger, and relied less on English support, than the effort which followed the death of James V

It would appear, then, that the attempts to eradicate abuses, rather than the abuses themselves, caused Scotsmen to attack the Church. Very little consideration will show that such was likely to be the case Till the decrees of the Council of 1549 it was possible for priests to hold in secret some or all of the doctrines of Luther, to teach them with discretion or not to teach at all, and still to enjoy their benefices But the decrees of the councils and the nature of the Catholic faith made such an attitude no longer tenable Henceforth a priest had to assent to the doctrines which the Church who commissioned him had defined, and to teach them If he still wanted to hold or teach the doctrines of Luther and his fellows with impunity, he must throw in his lot with those who would attack the Church by force.

So also was it with those who despised the law of clerical celibacy They might for a time evade the penalties which the councils had decreed, or conceal from the inquisitors their

ecclesiastical crimes, but the future trend of Church discipline was clear and the only way of evasion lay in the overthrow of the authority which imposed it. It was in March and April 1559 that the inquisition into the lives of the bishops was decreed. Within a year the bishops of Galloway and Argyll, notorious offenders against the law of clerical celibacy, were reported by Sadler to have joined the anti-Catholic party.

The third class of reform adumbrated by the conciliar decrees was, however, the one most dangerous to the Church's political strength. When the bishops forbade the holders of ecclesiastical benefices to let the Church lands for long terms or to feu them, they were attacking a recognized method by which noble families had enriched themselves. In that process many of the clergy had co-operated because they were of the same noble families, and many of them held the Catholic religion more lightly than the Church lands. The legislation, too, was but a first step to the ideal which the Tridentine fathers desired to realize, the use of the wealth of the Church for religion and charity. Men therefore, lay and cleric, who would have been prepared to resist the attacks on Catholic worship, who would not have opposed the higher standards of learning and virtue set by the councils, joined with the anti-Catholic party or at least did not oppose it, for by its success they would be able to keep their grip on the lands of the Church. The years of the last struggle and of the great change itself were marked by many a transfer of these lands to noblemen of whom some, like the earl of Cassilis, went to the limit of violence to obtain grants which would have been null and void had the conciliar legislation been enforced.

These three scandals, then, led to defections from the Church. The assembly of bishops, clergy, monks, and friars of 1549 set themselves 'utterly to extirpate' the heresies 'which cruelly assail the Lord's flocks committed to their care'. They saw rightly enough that ignorance and lewdness of life amongst the clergy meant heresy amongst both the clergy and the laity. They recognized that the laicization of Church lands was an impediment to the Church's teaching. But their efforts at reform, though they would in time have succeeded in Scotland

as elsewhere, at first only drove into the ranks of the Church's opponents those of her clergy who would not submit to her discipline or accept her ideals. And the very attempts of the bishops to restore the Church's wealth to religious uses, and to make its alienation impossible in the future, made enemies of many of the nobles. But the tragedy lay deeper than this. The evils which had been tolerated in the fifteenth century had opened the highest offices in the Church to men who would not accept her discipline and who had lost the clear sense of her authority. There were many even amongst those who sat in the reforming councils who were reluctant to amend their own lives or were too weak in will to do so. There were others who thought of authority only in terms of the nation. The former, at best, were slow to enforce the discipline urged by Trent and so allowed traitors to remain in ecclesiastical office, at worst, they would permit the destruction of the Catholic religion if their own possessions and dignities might so be saved. The latter class could not think of the Church as exercising its authority independently of the State. They looked to the civil governor to defend the Lord's flocks which had been committed to their care. While Cardinal Beaton lived the independence of the Church and her authority was clearly set before the people. In James V's phrase, 'there were two laws, the spiritual and the temporal'. But after Beaton's death, despite the excellent reforms inaugurated, there was none to lead the churchmen against those who attacked them. After 1554 the bishops looked to Mary of Lorraine, the widow of James V and now regent for her infant daughter, to defend the interests of the Catholic religion against those who would attack it. Mary of Lorraine had many excellent qualities. She was honest and economical as a governor, she made no charge to the country for her services and under her rule the treasury was delivered from debt; she was an excellent and even pious Catholic. But she did not concern herself with the defence of the Catholic religion. In all her Scottish correspondence¹ there is scarce a reference

¹ *Scottish Correspondence of Mary of Lorraine*, edited for the Scottish History Society, 3rd series, vol. x, by Dr Annie Cameron.

to the well-being of the Church in Scotland. She lamented to the Pope the decline of clerical discipline; she did little to assist the work of the provincial synods.

From the standpoint of orthodoxy that was a negative fault. It was far less harmful to the Church than a practice for which circumstances were responsible rather than the Regent. The Scottish nobles were so disposed to factions, and had so often been allied with England, that the Regent came more and more to rely on a small French garrison to ensure respect for her government. The bishops, no longer forming, as in the days of Cardinal Beaton, a strong national party, supported, as their religion bade them, the established and orderly government. To that extent they were identified with the French interest and the French alliance. In so far, then, as opposition grew to the French garrison, and such opposition was natural in a land where the nobles regarded the rewards of government as theirs by right, it provided material for a party opposed to the Catholic Church. Nobles who were indifferent to religious doctrines might easily throw in their lot with the heretics merely because they objected to being ruled by Frenchmen. And if the Protestant party could work up an anti-French spirit they would obtain the opportunity they sought for the destruction of the Catholic Church.

IV

While the Catholic Church in Scotland was endeavouring to introduce the reforms decreed by the Council of Trent, and was looking to the civil authority to protect it in that work, the group which sought its destruction was gaining strength. In large part this was due to the change from Lutheranism to Calvinism which had been effected in southern Germany, France, and Switzerland. Luther had endeavoured to impose on the Church his strange doctrine of justification by faith only, and had in consequence attacked such doctrines and practices as were clearly irreconcilable with his theory. He and his followers had gradually worked out a collection of positive doctrines, but the selection was to a large extent haphazard, and was modified in different places by different theologians.

They were still so much under the influence of Catholic tradition that they found it difficult to explain on what grounds they held their theories to have the warranty of God, and at times both Luther and his friends fell back on the claim of a private revelation.

For practical purposes this was useless, and so, as Lutheranism developed, its ultimate sanction came to be the civil authority of the prince who defended it and imposed it on the clergy of his dominions. In this way there was evolved that royal Protestantism which would have obtained in Scotland had James V accepted the advice of his uncle. It was such a religion that Arran and his friends had in mind in 1543.

During the decade which followed the death of James V a new religion had been worked out, described, and given concrete form by John Calvin. Accepting Luther's doctrine of justification, he asserted or emphasized the knowledge of their election by those whom God had pre-ordained for salvation. They formed the congregation of Jesus Christ, and it was their duty to use all the power at their disposal to enforce acceptance of the doctrine and worship they knew to be according to the will of God. Calvin, meanwhile, had set down the scheme of this doctrine, worship, and discipline. He did not rely, as Luther had done, on an appeal to private revelation. He claimed that his system followed logically from the Scriptures, and if a man did not follow the argument his reason was blinded, he was pre-reprobate by Almighty God, and it was the duty of the Congregation to carry out the punishments which had been pre-ordained. Calvin, by a prodigious industry, had elaborated the whole system in doctrine, discipline, and practice. He did not, like Luther, merely alter parts of the Catholic system and retain, or allow to be retained, such parts as he had not found inconsistent with his theory. Thus Calvin, presenting a religion entirely independent of tradition, gave the impression that it really was a logical deduction from the premiss—the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture. The warrant for the premiss, the accuracy of the exegesis, were easily lost sight of in the coherence of the deductions.

For Scotland the importance of this evolution came when one of the early preachers of the anti-Catholic party fell under the influence of Calvinism. John Knox, who had been a Catholic priest,¹ had been associated with George Wishart before the latter was strangled and burned as a heretic. After a band of Protestants had murdered Cardinal Beaton he joined them in the castle of S Andrews and was sentenced with them to the French convict galleys. After his release he studied and adopted the new form of Protestantism worked out by Calvin. His own training had been similar to that of Calvin, and he entered thoroughly into the spirit of the new religion. Even more vehemently than his master, he taught that it was the duty of the elect to suppress idolatry, i.e. Catholic worship, by violence, since such was the will of God. He made it the thesis of a sermon in England, where he preached during the reign of Edward VI, and he recurred to it again in the instructions which he wrote from France to the Protestant nobles of Scotland. He did not shrink from urging bloodshed and rebellion, at least if there was a likelihood that by such measures the rule of the elect could be promoted.

A group of the nobles who had collaborated with Sadler against Cardinal Beaton in 1543 met John Knox in the summer of 1555. Soon he became their favourite preacher, and under his direction the Scottish heretics generally adopted the Calvinist doctrine. It had, indeed, many advantages for the nobles over the earlier Lutheranism. As Knox expounded it, there was justification for the sacking and destruction of churches and monasteries, even without a political plea. The Calvinist doctrine, too, did not require the elect to wait on the conversion of the prince. Provided the elect could claim some sort of authority—be it only as lesser magistrates—such as the nobles claimed to possess, Calvinism bade them use it for the destruction of idolatry. And once the ‘congregation of Jesus Christ’ was formed their religion bade them impose this ‘gospel’ on their country. Some, no doubt, held the new doctrines in all sincerity,

¹ § 33 of Winzett's *To the Calvinane Prechours* would have been without point had men not known that John Knox had been a Catholic priest.

though the careers of these nobles both before and afterwards would not suggest it. When many of them later quarrelled with Knox, he, who knew them well, described them as moved by greed alone. Even the coherence of Calvinism seems not to have been of much importance as an inducement. Knox and Buchanan, who both wrote their histories as a justification of the movement in Scotland, remark not so much its logic as the fulfilment of the prophecies of its preachers, prophecies, indeed, whose fulfilment could be brought about by their supporters.

The activities of Knox stirred the civil authorities to some slight activity, and he thought it prudent to retire to France. Less than a year later the nobles with whom he had been associated were writing to him to return, on the ground that little was being done to suppress them and they were ready to risk all in their enterprise. The preacher hesitated, but the nobles, seizing the opportunity of a political border quarrel between England and Scotland, formed on the 3rd December 1557 a band or conspiracy to 'establish the most blessed word of God and his congregation and renounce all idolatry'.

As yet the objects of the association were not made public. In the following year the members supported the riots against the Church which occurred in several Scottish towns. Attempts to destroy the statues and attack the religious had been a feature of the preaching of the 'gospel' even in the earlier phase of the anti-Catholic movement. But then, as at Aberdeen in 1543, they had been easily suppressed by the local magistrates save when an English army was operating in the neighbourhood. In 1559, however, when the magistrates attempted to punish the ringleaders, or even to try them, a mob of armed nobles with their followers threatened bloodshed unless the whole affair were ignored. 'The evangel', Knox was to write later, 'began wondrously to flourish'.

In 1560 the Lords of the Congregation—as they were to be called—took the offensive. On the 1st January placards were affixed to the gates of many of the monasteries claiming the property in the name of the poor. It was called the Beggars' Warning, but bears all the marks of the 'evangel' of the

Congregation, whose members included some of the wealthiest nobles in the land

The government of Mary of Lorraine could not permit the open attacks made on the social order. She summoned the preachers to appear before a court of justice to defend their conduct. The preachers and their noble allies called themselves persecuted, and the Queen Mother postponed the summons. There may have been a misunderstanding as to this postponement. The Congregation certainly claimed that Mary of Lorraine should not allow their preachers to be molested in any way, even judicially. Further, they accused her of breaking promises to allow them to attack the Catholic Church with impunity. To prove this their writers gave three separate accounts of the negotiations—but their accounts contradict one another in questions of fact.

Meanwhile the Congregation had become an army avowedly directed against the existence of the Catholic Church. By May Dundee and Perth were filled with the troops of the Lords of the Congregation, and the government of the city was practically in their hands. Then there took place at Perth a riot in which all the ornaments and furniture of the Catholic churches were destroyed, the houses of the religious looted, the priests assaulted, the Sacrament of the Altar defiled. Knox, who was present and who wrote this part of his history in the following year, has left us in no doubt as to the origin of the violence. ‘The manner thereof,’ he wrote, ‘was this, the preachers before had declared how odious was idolatry in God’s presence, what commandment he had given for the destruction of the monuments thereof, what idolatry and what abomination was in the Mass.’

It was no part of the intention of the Lords to destroy the buildings, and the preachers endeavoured to get the mob to discriminate between things which were necessary for Catholic worship and things which had a temporal value. But there was no playing with the thought of toleration. The Congregation immediately decreed the penalty of death against any priest who should continue to worship God as men had done in Scotland for a thousand years. It was a declaration of war in the

physical, not the metaphorical, sense. Indeed the Congregation put it into words addressed 'to the congregation of anti-Christ, the pestilent priests and their shavelings'. They were told that henceforth the Protestants would begin 'that same war which God commanded Israel to execute against the Canaanites' and that 'contract of peace shall never be made until ye desist from your open idolatry and cruel persecution of God's children'.

The Lords of the Congregation had the military advantage of striking first. To it was added that of treachery in the forces of the legitimate government. After the success of the Protestants at Perth, Argyll and the Lord James Stuart, members of Mary of Lorraine's court, servants of her government, deserted openly to the conspirators, to whom they were already bound by secret oath. Success followed success. St Andrews, Cupar, the whole of Fife, Stirling, submitted to the rebel lords. Everywhere Protestantism flourished since the altars were thrown down, churches were sacked, and the Mass prohibited. In June they held Edinburgh, and the Queen Mother retreated to Dunbar. She asked them to allow the Mass to be continued at least in some churches of the capital while their preachers should be free to administer their own religion. She did not yet realize that the religion of John Knox was the destruction of Catholic worship: 'Neither could we suffer', he wrote of her suggestion, 'that right administration of the Sacraments should give place to manifest idolatry.'

The easy success of the forces of the Lords of the Congregation in 1559 gave the historians of later ages the impression that their aims were accepted, if they were not actively supported, by the greater part of Scotland. It is easy to leap in imagination from the sack of Perth, Stirling, and St Andrews to that day in August 1560 when an assembly of nobles and burghers publicly repudiated Catholicism in the name of Scotland. It is true, of course, that an English army was operating in Scotland on behalf of the Protestants before the repudiation became possible, but the rapidity of success suggests certainly that there was wide popular support for the Protestant cause.

Such a conclusion, however, would remain an act of the

imagination. It must be checked by the evidence of the time, and fortunately this is abundant. The letters of the Lords of the Congregation and of the English envoys enable us to correct the guesses of later writers.

It is curious, first of all, to find that in an appeal which the Protestant nobles made 'to the Lords of Scotland' in March 1560 there should be no mention of religion as the cause of their revolt.² But it does not seem so curious when we find six months earlier, in the English Cecil's correspondence, the minute of a letter directing the Protestants to appeal to the whole nobility of Scotland to join with them in an anti-French movement.³ Nor is it, then, surprising to find that Henry Balnaves, on behalf of the Lords of the Congregation, reported to Ralph Sadler on the 9th September 1559 that 'such as yet be not fully persuaded thereto (i.e. to Protestantism) bear nevertheless such hatred to the Frenchmen, as he thinketh in manner the whole realm favoureth their party'.⁴

It was an old trick with the Protestant lords to conceal the purpose of their actions. During the first phase George Douglas had written to the English ambassador (in 1543); 'I have laboured with all my power to do the King's (i.e. Henry VIII's) service, and will do while I live, wherein I have always pretended outwardly the commonwealth of Scotland and spake not much of England because I would not be suspected'.⁵ So in the second phase we understand what Balnaves meant when he assured Sadler that 'practices have been used and conferences had with the duke, the Earl of Huntly, and others'.⁶ At those conferences Huntly and the others would be told of the intention of France to conquer Scotland in the interests of the Guise family. They would be shown the letter which described the preparations for that attempt. They would not be told that Thomas Randall, the English agent, reported to his Ambassador. 'The prior of S. Andrews (Lord James Stuart) sent a letter to the Earl of Arran that he received out of France, containing

¹ *Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen*, edited for the Spalding Club, p. 316

² *The state papers and letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*, vol. 1, p. 713

³ *Ibid.*, p. 415

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 431

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 431

many news of the preparation against Scotland, with advice to seek the aid of England, which I guess to savour too much of Knox's style to come from France, though it will serve to good purpose.'¹

That the lords of the Congregation did not rely exclusively on the appeal of Protestantism is clear. The negotiations with England show further that they were unable to do so. Elizabeth had succeeded her sister on the throne of the southern kingdom in November 1558, and by July her ministers were in communication with the Scottish Protestants. The first condition of the alliance, made in that or the following month, was 'that it may be provided by consent of the three estates of the land (Scotland) that the land may be free from all idolatry (i.e. Catholicism) like as England is'.² There was, however, a serious difficulty. Elizabeth was officially at peace with Mary of Lorraine, the legitimate ruler of Scotland. There was no excuse therefore for Elizabeth to supply munitions or men for rebels against the Scottish government. 'We told them,' wrote the English agents, Sadler and Crofts, to Cecil, the English minister, 'that albeit their cause was founded in a good and godly foundation to extirpe idolatry . . . yet the world can make no other exposition of it but that they be as it were a faction gathered together contending against authority'.³

Despite this recognition of the facts Cecil directed the Scottish Protestants in August 1559 'to devise means whereby they might be helped by us, we to remain in peace as we do'.⁴ Cecil did not wait for suggestions. On the 12th September he was writing to Sadler, 'you were advised by my former letters from the Court to lend the Protestants money as of yourself, taking secretly the bonds of them to render the same, so as the Queen (Elizabeth) should not be a party thereto'.⁵ An additional caution was taken by the English. They sent French money so that none might guess whence it came.

It is customary nowadays to dismiss such curious methods

¹ *The state papers and letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*, vol 1, p 499

² *Ibid*, p 376

³ *Ibid*, p 432

⁴ *Ibid*, p 403

⁵ *Ibid*, p 439

of diplomacy as being well understood and even recognized in the sixteenth century. Unfortunately for such an explanation Elizabeth's own ministers recorded the shame of such bargains. When Knox urged the English government to supply his movement with men and munitions, Sir James Crofts protested that, since there was no cause for an open breach with the government of Scotland, 'we cannot *bona fronte* so colour and excuse the matter'.¹ But the principles of international morality—which seldom restricted for long the policy of Elizabeth—are not now in question. The correspondence is more interesting as evidence of the strength of the Protestant movement in Scotland. The Lords of the Congregation had not the means to keep an army in the field, nor could they rely on an army without the means to pay for it. They did their best by robbing the churches and churchmen. In October 1559 the Earl of Arran seized the rents of his brother, the archbishop of St Andrews, to maintain the war chest of the insurgents. At the same time they raided the coffers of the archbishop of Glasgow—and boasted of it to the English—, found them empty, and purposed to seize an abbey of that prelate's. By the following month they had descended to robbery with violence. 'The lords of the Congregation', wrote Randolph, one of the English agents, on the 11th November, 'have sent to take the bishop of Dunblaine, being an open adversary of their proceedings, and intend to make him pay well for he is rich'.²

But these methods did not suffice to keep the Protestant army in the field. In August of 1559 Knox had begged England for 1,500 arquebusiers and 300 horsemen.³ Sadler made a request on their behalf for almost the same number in September. The next month he wrote to his government: 'You shall perceive by Balnave's letters to us that about the end of next month they look for more aid of money or else, he saith, they shall not be able to keep their men together'.⁴ When the month was up the position of the Protestants was desperate. Balnave reported to Randall on the 21st October 1559. 'To maintain this matter

¹ *The state papers and letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*, vol. 1, p. 524.

² *Ibid.* p. 566. ³ *Ibid.* p. 400. ⁴ *Ibid.* p. 469.

we cannot keep our companies together howbeit the nobles remain. Therefore we think no fewer than three thousand footmen and three hundred horsemen necessary to be kept for three months to recover Leith again.¹

In this correspondence, then, there was no pretence that the common people of Scotland gave any support, even tacit support, to the Lords of the Congregation. Knox himself realized that a single reverse before Leith would mean the end of his hopes. 'If we assault and be repulsed', he wrote on the 23rd October, 'then shall our enterprise be in great hazard and our commons are not able to abide together.'² At the beginning of November they did assault and were repulsed. According to the Englishman Randolph, who described the event on the 11th November, the Protestants ran for their lives. The whole insurgent camp fled, in fact, to Stirling, and it was then that Knox wrote: 'We would never have believed that natural countrymen and women could have wished our destruction so unmercifully, and have so rejoiced in our discomfiture.'

The condition of affairs in Scotland was no secret to Cecil. Mary of Lorraine still held Leith and with her small French garrison kept the insurgents at bay. 'You shall do well', Cecil told Sadler at the end of October, 'to certify the Protestants that if they do not with speed take Leith, we shall have occasion to doubt of the end'.³ The failure of the next fortnight determined Elizabeth and her advisers; they dictated the letter by which the Protestant Scottish nobles were to implore the aid of Elizabeth so that she might have an excuse for sending an army. The appeal was written out according to English instructions and dispatched.⁴ Before it was made public an English fleet was on its way to assist the insurgent Protestants. In February an English army was assembled and the Scottish lords solemnly accepted Elizabeth as 'Protector' of their realm. The 'rights' of Mary Stuart were not to be touched, but her legitimate and authorized government was to be overthrown by foreign arms and foreign money.

¹ *The state papers and letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*, vol. 1, p. 511.

² *Ibid.*, p. 681

³ *Ibid.*, p. 532.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 569 and 604.

Everything should now have been easy for the lords of the Congregation. They boasted to their English allies in January 1560 that the Huguenots of France had promised the Lord James Stuart to take arms so as to embarrass the French government and make it impossible for Mary Stuart, now Queen of France, to send help to her mother. The nobles on whom Mary of Lorraine had relied, the Lord James, Maitland of Lethington, the earl of Arran, were all of their party. The earl of Huntly and others had been brought in on the anti-French device. Elizabeth's government was prepared to support them with money and munitions. An English army under the earl of Norfolk was marching on the capital of Scotland. Had their plans, their religion, been desired or even accepted by their countrymen there should have been no difficulty in destroying the Catholic Church. Yet there was difficulty, and grave difficulty. Norfolk found the forces at his command insufficient for the task. The English, he wrote, were deserting, and even English money brought in very few Scots to destroy idolatry. On the 7th May he wrote urgently for more money and more men. The temper of the inhabitants was touched on by another English commander, Sir George Howard, who wrote home. 'We are so well esteemed here that all our poor hurt men are fain to lie in the streets and can get no house room for money.'

Such was the attitude of the people of Edinburgh who saw what the new religion meant. Up to May 1560 they still, as Knox had reported, wished the destruction of the Protestant party unmercifully and rejoiced in their adversity. But their resistance centred around Mary of Lorraine, who was the legitimate governor and who was defended by a small garrison of Frenchmen, and on the 10th June Mary of Lorraine died. There was then no government in whose name the French garrison could continue to hold out against the English; no government round whom the people of Edinburgh could rally against the lords of the Congregation. The French demanded the right to return in honour to their native land, since their commission in Scotland had ceased. Norfolk granted it willingly. Henceforth the only body which could claim any kind of authority was the

Congregation, because it included the heir to the throne, Chatelherault (formerly the earl of Arran), the Lord James, bastard son of James V, and many other lords who had taken part in the government in the past. In the capital the work of destroying Catholic worship was completed, as it had already been in every other town where their armies had held sway.

In August an assembly of nobles, ecclesiastics, and burghers was held which arrogated to itself the authority of the three estates. Probably illegal in composition, in summons, in procedure, at the mercy of the armed forces of the Congregation, it decreed the abolition of the Mass, the repudiation of the authority of the Pope, the establishment of Calvinist worship and discipline according to a book of doctrine to be formulated by the preachers of the Congregation. Meanwhile the saying of Mass and even attendance at Mass were made penal offences, for the first offence confiscation of goods, for the second exile, for the third death was decreed against those who worshipped as their fathers had done for nigh a thousand years. And all magistrates were empowered and ordered to put these decrees into operation.

V

The evidence for the unpopularity of the Lords of the Congregation and their cause before the death of Mary of Lorraine is direct and overwhelming. It was not written after the event, and therefore dependent on hearsay or the memory of a witness. It was written while the Protestants were striving to win by arms and were anxious to persuade England of their future success. It was not written by Catholics who themselves disliked the novel doctrines, but by those who professed these doctrines to be the word of God. It was not written for publication or with a desire, as Knox later wrote his history, to impose an interpretation on the events. The letters of the Lords of the Congregation and of their preachers, the reports of the servants of the English government, could not have been written had the Protestant cause been popular.

Yet Protestantism was accepted by the generation who saw

its military triumph in the summer of 1560, when its army was the only organized military force in Scotland. From then, for many generations, Scotland, or the greater part of it, was to accept the yoke of that religion which the Lords of the Congregation called the Gospel.

Whatever explanation is offered of the Reformation in Scotland must be consistent with those two facts, the evidence for which does not depend on any theory of psychology. And before making use of the guess-work of that science it will be as well to consider the process of the acceptance according to the historical evidence.

Even before the death of Mary of Lorraine the Catholics had been deserted by three of their nominal leaders. At various times after the alliance with England the Lords of the Congregation had boasted that the bishops of Galloway, Argyll, and Moray had thrown in their lot with the Protestants. They were all men who would have suffered from the inquisition into concubinage among the bishops, decreed by the last provincial council of the Catholic Church in Scotland before 1560. From then on they appear as married men, retaining their ecclesiastical titles and the greater part of the revenues which had been given them to uphold the Catholic faith. The action of these bishops was imitated by many of the clergy. Ninian Winzet, the priest schoolmaster of Linlithgow, who wrote his tractates in these years, describes how, in the area he knew, 'an whore was cloaked by the name of a wife' and the 'runagate priests' married their 'harlots', while the monks sought the world for the same reason.¹

In this sense, indeed, the failure of the Church to discipline its clergy led to the success of Protestantism. The recalcitrant priests seized this opportunity of safely defying the law of the Church to whose service they had vowed their lives. The Catholics found themselves deserted at the moment of crisis by many to whom they had looked for leadership. Worse was to follow: many of these apostate priests, accustomed to the exercise of spiritual authority, soon took high places in the ranks of the preachers. In their own areas they knew who were sincere,

¹ Winzet's *Certane Tractates* (Scottish Text Society, no. 15), vol. 1, pp. 110, 127, 128.

who wavering, amongst the clergy, they were accustomed to be obeyed and found it, therefore, the easier to establish Calvinism in the churches which had been built for Catholic worship. Such was John Wynram at St Andrews, who, having been subprior of the old chapter, became the ruler of the new presbytery. Such also was Dean Patrick Kinloquhy, who drove Ninian Winzet out of Linlithgow because he refused to apostatize.

Even those who remained loyal to the Church were terrorized. Archbishop Hamilton of St Andrews, whose brother, the head of the family, was already with the Lords of the Congregation, lost heart when the English forces appeared. On the 10th February 1560 Randall wrote to his government, 'the bishop of S Andrews desireth to have some poor place to retire himself to'¹ Such men were not likely to raise an army of defence when the Lords of the Congregation held Edinburgh by armed force, and the English were still on the borders. The best they could do was to await the return of their sovereign, Mary Stuart, and hope that she would reverse the Acts which were decreed in 1560.

Meanwhile the events in Edinburgh were being repeated in the other towns of Scotland. There is no evidence for supposing that the anti-Catholic enactments of 1560 were put into force as soon as they were heard of. Wherever there is evidence it is of an organized descent on a town by an armed party, supported by a section of the town, and carrying out the destruction of Catholic worship by force. So it was natural, then, to talk not of a country 'becoming protestant', but of a city being 'reformed'. The terminology persisted in Scotland well on into the seventeenth century. So we must picture Scotland being 'reformed' piecemeal. In some cases, as at Perth and St. Andrews, the work was done before the decrees of 1560. At Linlithgow Winzet was able to maintain his position for a year after their enactment; in fact, till Spottiswoode and Kinloquhy came down with a party of the lords and drove him out and forced the citizens to submit.² At Aberdeen the struggle between the two sections

¹ *The state papers and letters of Sir Ralph Sadler*, vol. i, p. 705.

² Winzet, op. cit., 1, 26, 49, 50.

went on for nearly a year. A small group of the town council decreed the 'reform' at a hurried meeting, an action condemned by the provost and other magistrates on their return.¹ For months the struggle went on, but the military power of the Protestants eventually overawed the Catholics. Knox himself has described how a party of the Lords of the Congregation rode to Glasgow and effected the establishment of Calvinism there. The abbots of Dunfermline, Deer, and Crossraguel maintained the worship for which their monasteries were built. They were driven out by violence, their buildings largely destroyed, their property reft from them, usually by their Protestant relatives.

So the immediate change was effected. The details which have been recorded fit in easily enough with the famous passage Ninian Winzet wrote at the time, wherein he ascribes the success of the revolution to three main causes, or idols as he calls them. The first, he says, was the greed of princes (nobles) who sought the wealth of the Church. The second was the silence of the bishops; some of them pretended to agree with the Reformers' doctrines, some joined whatever party seemed stronger, some spent their time lamenting their lost power and wealth. And the third idol of the times, and the worst, Winzet said, was the false preacher who showed himself as God and demanded the spiritual obedience of all people to his doctrine.

To effect the suppression of Catholic worship was one thing: to maintain that suppression and to bring the people to accept the Calvinist system as a habit was another. Again it must be remembered that the process is not to be found in successive acts of the central government, but in the local control in each town and district. The Calvinist system gave to all magistrates a place of importance in religious life. It was incumbent on them to bring the people to the Calvinist way of life. So every magistrate and body of magistrates who accepted the new religion found their power over their fellow citizens increased. Under the Catholic régime they had but temporal control, now they shared the spiritual rule. The synods, presbyteries, Kirk Sessions

¹ *Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen*

enabled the ministers and the wealthier citizens to use all the administrative machinery to compel acceptance of the new religion. It is in the records of the Kirk Sessions particularly that the process of Calvinizing Scotland in the later sixteenth century can be studied. Those of St. Andrews have been printed *in extenso* for these years and form an admirable example.¹ Priests who spoke against the new religion were fined, and fined heavily. Later, those who would not profess the new religion were imprisoned and only released if they made a public abjuration of the religion in which they had been educated.² The conduct of these inquisitions was entrusted to one who had been a priest, who knew well how to make evasion impossible. In one case, at least, they made their unfortunate prisoner 'marry' a woman so as to ensure the breach with Catholicism. Even priests who abstained altogether from exercising their ministry were not exempt. Some by doing so had obtained, in virtue of an Act of Parliament, the enjoyment for life of part of the revenues attached to their former office. The Kirk Session of St Andrews decreed that unless they submitted to the presbytery, i.e. professed the Calvinist religion, they should be deprived of their revenues.³ Once the local clergy had been bullied into submission care was taken that no help should come to the Catholics from the outside. In 1566 word was sent from the Edinburgh Presbytery that a priest who had not yet apostatized was to pass north through St. Andrews as a messenger of the Queen. The local Kirk Session warned him that if he attempted to do so no citizen would be allowed to supply him with lodging or food unless he submitted to the presbytery.⁴

Nor were the laity left to decide their own religion. John Knox was brought down to purge the city a second time of 'idolatry', and all who murmured against him—and there were several in 1560—were denounced to the magistrates for civil correction.⁵ Three years later a general inquisition was ordered into the faith of suspects, and those who would not answer to

¹ *S. Andrews Kirk Session Register 1559–1600*, 2 vols., edited for the Scottish History Society by the late Dr Hay Fleming.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 82.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 76

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 16 n., 33

the satisfaction of the presbytery were to be 'repelled' by the magistrates, to lose their rights as citizens, to lose the protection of the civil law¹ Even so slight an attachment to the ancient faith as the desire to abstain from work on Christmas Day or Hallow-e'en became an offence One unfortunate cobbler, found guilty of not working on Christmas Day, had to promise that in future he would show his disdain for the historic faith of Scotland by doing some personal task on that day² Nor was the mere abstention from papistical observances sufficient to secure the citizens peace. By the end of a decade of 'reform' the magistrates of St Andrew's had instituted, at the suggestion of the presbytery, a house-to-house visitation during the time of the sermon, and those who had not attended were punished as evildoers Even failure to attend the Calvinist communion was a fault for which explanation was required and penalties imposed.

Probably the most efficient machinery lay in the administration of the marriage and baptism laws By the rules of the new Kirk the Catholic ceremonies were invalid To the Catholic the newfangled ceremonies were at best of dubious validity, at worst a sacrilegious mummery, and always a participation in forbidden heretical worship But if a Catholic had his child baptized by one who was not a minister of the new ecclesiastical organization he was liable to heavy penalties. If a Catholic was married before a priest he was guilty of fornication in the judgement of the presbytery. If his union was declared null and void in a 'papistical' court and he married, he was treated by the Kirk Session as an adulterer. The punishment for all these offences was heavy and public. Yet they were incurred again and again, as the records of the Kirk Sessions bear witness In the case of baptism it is clear that refusal to accept the rite from the ministers was often due to an unwillingness to recognize the new religion It is very probable that many charges of fornication—and the records are full of them—refer to those marriages where one or both of the spouses insisted on a Catholic marriage. A relatively large number of ministers and readers

¹ *S. Andrews Kirk Session Register 1559-1600*, vol 1, pp 137, 376.

² *Ibid*, p 389

of the new Kirk were punished for adultery,¹ and that sin may have been more frequent among their followers, but it is difficult to believe that the first effect of enforcing Calvinism was to make the citizens indifferent to the sanctity of marriage.

In these ways, then, the citizens were brought to accept the new religion. All the force of governmental administration in St Andrews was on the side of the group of ministers who made up the presbytery. Economic pressure and administrative tyranny made the Catholics first conceal their religion, and then occasionally conform to the new order. Then their domestic life was invaded. If it was not sanctioned by the preachers it was held up to opprobrium as public sin. The identification in proclamations of Catholics with dissolute persons was not done without motive. The teaching of the new conventions of respectability was imposed on the young, whose education was wholly in the hands of the ministers, whatever the beliefs of the parents. To persist in being a Catholic was to be driven into the helot class, to lose the means of making a substantial living, to be publicly branded a sinner.

The methods by which the Scots in general were brought to accept Calvinism differed, then, from those by which they had been kept loyal to Catholicism. In both cases, of course, public repudiation was punished ultimately by death according to the law. But there was a difference in that the death penalty had formerly been imposed on those who rejected and attacked a religion which had been tried for centuries and on which the whole social structure had been built, while after 1560 death was decreed against those who refused to accept a new religion utterly foreign to the traditional civilization. But the ultimate penalty for rejecting a religion does not enter so closely as some would suppose into motives for accepting it, any more than the penalty for treason determines loyalty to the nation. Acceptance of a religion is a series of positive acts of assent to doctrine and of worship, and it is the motive of these acts which specify the manner of accepting religion. In the years before 1560 the positive acts of Catholicism, profession of the faith, reception

¹ *S. Andrews Kirk Session Register 1559-1600*, vol. 1, e.g. pp. 170-90.

of the sacraments, assistance at Mass, were sanctioned only by spiritual penalties. No temporal punishment followed a neglect of confession and communion. After 1560, as the records of the Kirk Sessions show, men were fined and even imprisoned for refusing to attend the Calvinist sermon, for refusing to accept the Calvinist communion. The whole weight of the local administration pressed on those who were reluctant to accept the new religion. And it is not surprising that this administrative pressure, this discipline as they called it, was far more potent than the old spiritual and moral authority in keeping men obedient to the ecclesiastical system. Only it meant that loyalty to religion was psychologically a different thing.

Despite the supine cowardice or treachery of the bishops and many of the clergy, despite the discipline of Kirk Sessions and municipalities, Catholicism did not perish in these years. There were some among the clergy who preached openly against the 'new idol'—as Ninian Winzet named the Calvinist preachers. Quentin Kennedy, abbot of Crossraguel, was famous in the west country; the Dominicans, Black at Aberdeen, Cunningham at Glasgow, preached in defence of Catholicism even though a party of the Lords of the Congregation were 'reforming' their cities.

Two chaplains of Mary Stuart, who returned to Edinburgh in 1561, defended the Queen's faith openly. Ninian Winzet was himself no mean controversialist, and names Maxwell as another. These, and others who are but names now, issued challenge after challenge to the new preachers to show by what authority they claimed to impose a religion on the minds of men, but in no case have we record of a serious answer. But, while their challenges remained without reply, the Catholics had to worship, as Winzet says, in 'Kirkyards, Chambers, and barns', since the churches built for Catholic worship were seized by the armed forces of the Congregation.

The return of the Queen Mary Stuart meant that the Mass was restored in Holyrood Chapel. An Act of Toleration of August 1561 which forbade public dispute about religion until the Queen should take order in the matter, was looked to by the Catholics to give them some relief, and in Edinburgh, where

alone it was effective, many openly acknowledged their loyalty to the religion of their fathers. The Papal envoys to Mary Stuart's court hoped to stir the faithful bishops and clergy into leadership. But the old Scots clergy were still too cowardly. They would wait until the Queen took further action, or they would be content with practising their religion in some of the areas of the north where the great nobles still clung to Catholicism.

Meanwhile the Protestant lords and magistrates used all their power and force to terrorize the Catholics. In October 1561 the magistrates of Edinburgh decreed the expulsion from the city of all 'Catholics and dissolute persons'. On the 4th September of the following year, Eglintoun and some twenty others of the nobles and gentry of the west formed themselves into a band to suppress papistry by all means in their power. Riots against Catholics were organized in the chief cities throughout 1562 and, by virtue of the Act of Toleration, the Protestant magistrates decreed the seizure of the printing presses whence Ninian Winzet and those like him had been issuing their defence of the doctrines of the Catholic Church. The Catholic leaders were rounded up and exiled, or fled to escape worse punishments.

Yet many of the people of these little towns could not be brought to accept Calvinism. Again and again in the Kirk Sessions records of St Andrews, during the remaining years of the century, evidence appears of the reluctance with which the inhabitants conform, and of the suspicion of the rulers that many of their citizens are secret Papists.¹ In 1563 there were riots against the preachers, and great numbers flocked to Mass when it was said in the neighbourhood. In 1564 the presbytery urge that Papists be sought out and dealt with 'according to law'. At Edinburgh the people were more fortunate, for when the court was there, they could frequent the Sacraments in the Queen's chapel; and in 1567 her chaplain was able to count 12,606 who made their Easter duties according to the Catholic rites. This catholicism of the Lowlands survived Mary's defeat and imprisonment. In 1580 the presbyterian reader at Neilston,

¹ *S. Andrews Kirk Session Register 1559-1600*, vol. i, pp. 33, 76, 106, 107, 137, 170, 193, 226, 371, 373, 376

a village near Glasgow, complained that his life was not safe because of the anger of the villagers at the imprisonment of their old priest for Mass-saying. In the following year the presbyteries of the Lothians write to the Privy Council asking that something be done to put down the many papists in their districts.¹ Even as late as 1586, after a generation of Protestant government, a report from Scotland to the English Privy Council, describing the spread of Protestant doctrines, remarks that 'the number seemeth not great especially after so long preaching the Gospel, and the use of discipline'. And a generation later again, whenever the Jesuit Missionaries came to Edinburgh or Glasgow, they could still count on finding three or four houses where the Catholics congregated to hear their religion preached or to assist at Mass.²

The 'reforming' of the towns was the keystone in the building of a Calvinist Scotland. From them it spread into the countryside around, and the Kirk Sessions kept careful watch on the suppression of papistry in the parishes. Where it was found to be difficult, an 'unreformed' or half-reformed parish was joined to one which had more efficient ministers and elders, or a delegation was sent out from the neighbouring town. So, too, the presbyteries of the different cities kept in constant touch lest the work of discipline should break down in any of them.

Such work did not need the constant interference of the central government and its armed forces. Besides the initial step of placing in authority and power such of the wealthier citizens as were devoted to the Congregation, it was necessary only to maintain a sufficient threat of military action against an organized revolt. Such was within the power of the central government of Scotland for all areas except some in the north. The success, then, of the Calvinizing of Scotland can be understood if, in addition to the 'discipline', we can account for the support given to Calvinism by the central government and its acceptance or toleration by the nobles.

¹ Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, vol. III, p. 273, 277.

² Records of the trial of John Ogilvie S.J., printed in Brown, *John Ogilvie* (Burns & Oates, 1925), pp. 203, 269.

When the Queen Mary Stuart returned to her country in 1560 she insisted on remaining a Catholic, and having a Catholic chapel for herself and such of her court as desired to attend. But from the first she was in the power of her half-brother the Lord James Stuart, whom she created earl of Murray, and of his friends. In practice the lords of the Congregation were still the central government of Scotland. While she reigned, such of the nobles as remained Catholics or returned to their faith were able to practise their religion in their own homes, and to give shelter to priests, even if the latter had to be disguised as servants or school-masters. Such liberty was effective in preventing the nobles from taking more active measures to overthrow the oligarchy who ruled. The earl of Huntly, however, who had allied himself with the Congregation but had repented of it, did make an endeavour in 1562 to rescue the Queen from the group of nobles who governed in her name. Murray persuaded her that it was a revolt against her authority, and was able to use that authority to raise an army which overcame Huntly's forces. The rest of the seven years of her liberty in Scotland were spent in ineffective attempts to secure a measure of independence without bloodshed. The Pope urged her to make a bold attempt to restore Catholicism, but she was afraid it would mean war and might fail. Last of all she saw some promise of freedom in a marriage with the Protestant earl of Bothwell. She was badly treated by him, and worse by the lords of the Congregation who, with Murray, urged her to this step and used it to destroy her credit. In the story of the establishment of Calvinism she was an unimportant character because she was powerless.

The refusal of Queen Mary to put herself at the head of a Catholic party was one reason for the inactivity of those nobles who disliked the new religion during these years. Another and probably stronger motive lay in the distribution of Church property. The lands and revenues of the Church, which belonged to it both by canon and civil law, to which the Catholic institutions had the same right as the nobles to their property, or the towns to theirs, were treated by the consent of all as a

means to buy support for the new religion. But with a difference. The preachers could not rely apparently on voluntary support from their congregations, and they had used the 'rascal multitude' to drive out the clergy who were in possession. So John Knox proposed in the *First Book of Discipline* that all the wealth of the Church should be distributed between the new preachers, the poor, and the education of future generations in the 'gospel'. And he wanted to call on the 'rascal multitude' again to effect the transfer, by violence if necessary. But the nobles, now responsible for the government of the country, or as Knox would have it, from motives of greed, no longer saw the use of mob action. It had been excellent to use a Beggars' Petition, demanding the 'restoration' of monastic property to the poor, in the days before August 1560, for then the aim of the Congregation had been to discredit the Catholic clergy. It was a different matter when the clergy could no longer demand back the lands which the nobles held from them on long leases, and when they would be glad to hand over the remainder in return for small pensions. It was all very well to denounce 'cursing' for teinds when it was done by Catholics, it was another thing to refuse to pay them to a lay holder. And it was further necessary to secure acceptance of the revolution by nobles who did not belong or were only nominally attached to the new religion; their interests must be vested in the maintenance of the decrees of 1560. Many of the lay holders of Church lands were at least friendly to Catholicism; but they might be expected to tolerate the new order if their life interest in Church property were respected. The monks, no one of whom had formerly a title to the possessions of their house, might be expected to settle down in civil life if they were allowed to divide the revenues of the community among themselves. Nobles who were indifferent in religion, and even some who were Catholic, might be expected to abandon resistance if the abbeys which they or their relatives held in *commendam*, or the abbey lands they held in feu, were erected into temporal and heritable lordships. The Crown especially, whose income was always less than its expenditure, might well accept a *fait accompli* if its income depended thereon.

For these political reasons, if not from the motive of greed which Knox alleged, the nobles, guided by that very able politician Maitland of Lethington, insisted in 1561 that one-third of the Church revenues should be divided between the Crown and the Protestant Church, while two-thirds should be given to the 'auld possessouris' for the term of their lives. In this way those of the clergy who were willing to do nothing to defend the doctrines of the Church which had ordained them kept a part of the incomes they had received for preaching those doctrines. The threat of losing their livelihood was an added sanction for their toleration of the new order. But the arrangement was operative only for a time. As the presbyteries became better organized they insisted on the Catholic clergy conforming to Calvinist worship, and if they would not they were deprived of their revenues. An even shorter process was sometimes adopted. At Dunblane a laird's family had founded a prebendary in the Cathedral. In 1560 the laird joined the Congregation, but the chaplain refused to become a Calvinist. By agreement between the laird and the presbytery the chaplain was evicted, and one of the laird's sons was named to the prebendary in his stead.¹

Partly by such methods, partly by direct terrorization and violence, as with regard to the lands of Deer and Crossraguel, a great part of the possessions of the Church had been made over to temporal lords in perpetual feu in the years 1558–62. All the lands, too, of the abbeys which were held *in commendam* were in the nominal possession of nobles who declared themselves, after 1560, laymen and nothing more. Marriage no longer invalidated their title to these lands since they were the 'auld possessouris'. So the 'auld possessouris' often turned out to be the lords of the Congregation, a fact which explains John Knox's bitterness and accusations against his associates.

While this distribution of itself made it profitable for many nobles, lairds, and the old clergy not to resist the new religion, not to attempt to undo the work of the revolutionaries of 1560, its effects continued into the next generation. As the 'auld

¹ *Hist MSS Comm*, 10th Rep., part 1, p. 75

possessouris', whether clergy or laymen, died out their lands reverted to the Crown. Each successive government in those troubled times needed support and had to buy it. So when the land and revenues fell to the Crown—and in 1578 it was formally declared that all were annexed—the greater part of them was used for the erection of temporal lordships, for the increase of power of one or other of the nobles' families. In effect there took place under all the governments of these years what Maitland said of James VI after he came of age 'He considered well that offers would be made by every possessor, who would bestow large money to obtain the gift thercof to himself heritably, and the king was frank in granting lands as he might be persuaded, being facile of his nature; and thereby he thought to make gain of a part of the offers to be made, as it fell out indeed.'¹

The conditions, then, of the generation which followed the revolution of 1560 favoured the success of Calvinism. The armed forces and the name of the government were at the disposal of men who had been lords of the Congregation, and who had profited by the changes effected. The greater part of the nobles had had a share of the plunder of the Church, and for many years there was a chance to gain more by being friendly with those who ruled. The old beneficed clergy were likely to lose much more, in fact all they had and even their lives, if they showed open disapproval of the new religion. Meanwhile, according to the tenets of Calvinism, the municipal gentry were associated in the work of disciplining the citizens in the new order. They gained power as they were enthusiastic in that work, and they were sure of governmental support and protection. At the same time the rulers could rely on enthusiastic work by the Calvinist ministers whenever they attempted the robbery or ruin of a noble who went back to the faith of his fathers. So in the regencies which succeeded the imprisonment of Queen Mary, under the rule of Murray, Morton, and Lennox, there were these sporadic efforts to eliminate whatever remained of Catholicism in Scotland.

¹ Quoted from *Historie of King James the Sixth*, by R. K. Hannay, Scottish Historical Review, xvi, 71

The new men almost over-reached themselves. There were quarrels amongst the ministers, usually of a personal nature. After twenty years they had fallen into such disrepute that it was necessary to pass sumptuary laws forbidding them the use of gay apparel and gilded knives, while at the other extreme it was necessary to give some of them leave to keep ale-houses. A few had been persuaded by the earl of Morton, the regent, to accept, in 1572, the titles of bishops so that they might legally hand over the ancient revenues to the Crown; for this they were given a far higher salary than they had enjoyed as ministers. From this began their divisions, but it was a division of persons rather than of doctrine, and the vilification of each side by its opponents was as unmeasured as the attacks on the Catholic clergy by the heretics had been in earlier years.

Another source of weakness lay in the organization of the Calvinist religion. Essentially municipal, it had no special place for the territorial magnate except as a member of a group of magistrates. So it had no special attraction for the Scottish nobles unless they happened to be associated with the governing faction of a city or of the State. The oligarchies which ruled Scotland after the Queen's imprisonment feared and detested the nobles who were not with them and who might displace them. So from time to time these men, Murray and Morton and their associates, allowed the presbyteries to impose one of their number on the household of any noble who had not yet professed Calvinism, and forced him to listen to the Calvinist preachings and to allow his children to be taught by the minister.

The pressure of this sporadic tyranny and the natural opposition to oligarchic government made many Scottish nobles ready to resist by force of arms if they saw a chance of success. They were encouraged thereto by some of the priests of the Society of Jesus who returned during the years after the Queen's imprisonment. Among them the famous names were Gordon, Hay, Crichton, men of the noble families who suffered under the Calvinist tyranny. They had been sent abroad to receive their education, and had been trained either in the old Scots Monastery of St James at Ratisbon, or in the newer Jesuit

colleges at Louvain and Douai. Devoted to the Catholic religion, they endeavoured to promote it by the same methods as Winzet had used. They challenged ministers to debate, they preached, they wrote. But at the same time they encouraged what would now be called political methods. They knew that the revolution had been effected a few years earlier by an armed rising of the nobility supported by the money and arms of England. They saw no reason why it should not be reversed by an armed rising assisted by a Catholic power. They knew that the revolution had trampled on the traditional right of the Scottish people to the Catholic religion, they urged the Scottish nobles to regain that right by arms. They knew that the only constitutional resistance which was traditional in Scotland was the resistance of the nobles, and they were prepared to urge such a course to overthrow the oligarchy which had driven the legitimate ruler to exile and imprisonment.

At first all went well for the plan, and Father Crichton, who was its chief promoter, was able to discuss it with the regent Lennox. The latter was induced to sign an agreement that the boy King, James VI, should be sent abroad to be educated as a Catholic, and that meanwhile toleration for Catholics should be allowed.¹ The scheme required money, since its opponents could rely on the resources of Queen Elizabeth. While Father Crichton struggled with the delays of the Roman Curia and the Catholic powers, England acted. The boy King was seized by some anti-Catholic nobles, Lennox was exiled, and once more the persecuting laws were put into force.

In the next few years the young King James VI was gathering more and more power into his hands, cleverly using the resources of the Crown and the quarrels of the nobles and the ministers for this purpose. He had many friends among those who sympathized openly or secretly with the persecuted Catholics, and Father Gordon, who succeeded Crichton, hoped to gain from him a measure of toleration. He was so far successful that

¹ MSS account of Fr William Crichton, Stonyhurst MSS. Excerpts from this and letters of other contemporary Jesuits are printed in Forbes-Leith *Narratives of Scottish Catholics* (Baker, London, 1889).

he could hold a dispute with a leading presbyterian divine, George Hay, and as a result some of the northern nobles, among them the earl of Errol, again became Catholics Father John Dury meanwhile, working in Dumfries, had converted the governor, Lord Maxwell, and many of the inhabitants On Christmas Day, 1585, he was able to celebrate the full Catholic liturgy in an old monastery outside the town But Sir George Douglas had already reported to Elizabeth that many nobles of indifferent religion 'being now joined to the papists make that party both greater in number of nobility and stronger in force'. With English aid the exiled earls of Angus and Mar, leaders of the English party, returned to Scotland in 1585 at the head of a small army They seized the King, and James, willingly or unwillingly, made an alliance with Elizabeth which bound him to maintain the Protestant faith in Scotland, or to put it crudely, to persecute the Catholics.

All this time the Jesuit fathers and their supporters among the nobility seem to have hoped to gain the secret support of James VI They did not know his character. when Elizabeth, after instigating the gaolers to put Mary to death without a warrant, allowed her own warrant of execution to be carried out in 1587, James was willing to accept Elizabeth's explanation on condition that his claim to the succession of England was recognised¹ The execution of Mary revolted many nobles who were still Protestant, and they joined with the Catholics to ask the King for toleration for the ancient faith. The request was made in form in 1592 and James answered that it was easier to approve than to grant. On this the Catholic nobles arranged with Philip of Spain to send a force to Scotland sufficient to protect the King should his government be endangered by the grant of toleration. The plot was discovered —there were many in it who were not Catholics—and the laird of Fintry was executed. The ministers and the Protestant lords were urgent with the King to declare the outlawry of every man whom the presbyteries declared to be a Papist. There was a riot at Edinburgh, stirred up by the ministers,

¹ Cf Rait and Cameron, *The King's Secret*, p. 189 n. and chap. vi *passim*.

when James refused this last measure of persecution. The King's liberty and perhaps his life were in danger, and he sent Fathers Gordon and Crichton to Rome with a letter which implied the granting of liberty of conscience to all Catholics in return for financial assistance from the Pope.

When the priests returned in 1594, the earls of Huntly and Errol were in arms. They easily defeated a royal force under Argyll at Glenlivet, but on the persuasions of the King, and the promise of security for their clansmen and property, they went into exile for six months. Meanwhile James surrendered to the clamorous demands of the presbyteries and the secret instructions of England. Huntly and Errol were only allowed to return on condition of hearing sermons with the specific object of preparing them to submit to the established Protestantism. Last of all, they were told that peace could be obtained at no less price 'Deceive not yourself', the King wrote to Huntly, 'to think that by lingering of time, your wife and your allies shall get you better conditions. I must love myself and my own estate better than all the world, and think not that I will suffer any professmg a contrary religion to dwell in this land.'

The effort of the Catholics to defend their faith in speech and writing had been largely defeated by the 'discipline' of Calvinism carried out in all the towns of Scotland. The effort to obtain liberty of speech and writing and worship by political action had also failed. It would be absurd to call it unconstitutional, since it was an endeavour to redress wrongs inflicted by violence. It would be equally absurd to call it immoral, unless all political action in defence of the traditions of a people be immoral. It would be mistaken to call it foolish, since, with the protection of the King and the nobles, Catholicism freely expressed would have regained many adherents. At least that was the view of the presbyteries and the English government who did all in their power to deny it a hearing. But there were grave weaknesses in political action. It was weak because the Catholic priests had to work largely with the nobility, and therefore left the towns, the pivots of military action, in the hands of their opponents, who could easily suppress those with

Catholic sympathies It was weak also because the Catholic nobles had to take into their alliance others who detested the presbyteries and the violently Protestant lords but were not themselves Catholics. Such men were a danger in the hour of crisis. At best they might desert, at worst they would betray Above all it was weak because it relied on the characters of the nobles and the King The nobles had not the stuff of martyrs in them. Under the threats of the King, Huntly and Errol apostatized, to repent only later in life But the King, who had led them to believe that he favoured the movement, had already made his choice. He would do nothing which might imperil his succession to the throne of England. Perhaps his attitude is best expressed by the remark which he was said to make to his wife when she was received into the Catholic Church 'Well, wife, if you cannot live without this sort of thing, do your best to keep it as quiet as possible; for, if you don't, our crown is in danger' But the judgement of the contemporary Father McWhirrie was also not far from the mark

The single object of his ambition is the crown of England, which he would gladly take to all appearance from the hand of the devil himself, though Catholic and heretic ministers were all ruined alike, so great is his longing for that regal dignity Fear of Catholic ascendancy, or the hope of obtaining the favourite object of his ambition, might one day make him a hypocrite, but only a great miracle of God's power and an extraordinary inspiration will ever make him a Catholic in reality

King James, indeed, was the man who destroyed national Catholicism in Scotland The discipline of the Kirk was sufficiently disliked to leave a small devoted body of Scottish Catholics in each city, ready at every opportunity to claim their heritage of religion The failure of the political movement did not necessarily mean its permanent abandonment. But James succeeded in imposing on municipal Calvinism a form of the royal Protestantism of England and Germany which was all the stronger for its basis of Calvinist discipline. The power of the presbyteries was largely destroyed, and was replaced by that of perpetual moderators who were Crown nominees, and

who in 1610 received consecration from three Anglican bishops. More important for the country at large was the fact that James henceforth treated this modified Calvinism as part of the royal tradition, to be accepted because it was the King's religion, and required his subjects to admit that its overthrow or attempted overthrow was immoral in all circumstances. It may be that James learnt this trick from William Cecil, the minister of Queen Elizabeth, who was adopting it and enforcing it in England. Between them they put it into legal form by the oath of allegiance demanded from Catholics there in 1606. Of course, in theory the claim was directly opposed to the Catholic religion, since it claimed spiritual authority for the King and morality for acts which proscribed the Catholic religion as idolatrous and denied the spiritual authority of the Pope. But James had already been acting on this claim in Scotland. In practice he required from his subjects acceptance of the decrees establishing Calvinistic worship simply because they had the King's authority. It was easier for many men to accept them on this ground than on those set forth in the *Institutes* of Calvin. In practice James would require the Scottish nobles not to interfere when he forbade men to profess spiritual obedience to the Holy See, when he forbade them to say Mass or to hear it. If they were willing to accept these laws as part of their country's traditions, if they were willing to allow those who broke them openly to be punished, then the King might connive at their failure to conform to the requirements of the presbyteries, and even at their occasionally hearing Mass in secret. He might even employ them in government provided that they allowed the law against Mass-saying to be put into operation. It was a tempting situation to many a Catholic noble. By availing himself of the King's friendship he could preserve his estates and his liberty. His wife and children could remain faithful and he could occasionally receive the Catholic sacraments. But it meant that he must do nothing to bring the sacraments to his fellow countrymen. It meant that he must suffer the Catholics of the towns or of districts where the lairds were Calvinist to be dragooned into conformity with the state.

religion It meant that he must allow any fellow-Catholic who had incurred the enmity of the King or of the King's friends to suffer for his religion.

Father Abercromby, who was in Scotland during these years, described the lot of those whom the King did not protect

The system of persecution followed is first to excommunicate the Catholic landowner, who afterwards is either banished from the country, or sent to prison and deprived of all his goods If the wife be a Catholic she is excommunicated and her husband is not allowed to keep her in the house, and if the husband is a heretic, the ministers and magistrates allow him to take another wife, according to the present laws of the country Should the children or the servants be Catholic, they are likewise excommunicated, and the parents are obliged to turn them out of the house

It is little wonder that in these years many Scottish families disappeared, reduced to beggary either at home or abroad But meanwhile some of the Catholic nobles who were left, who often clung to the faith which was illegal, enjoyed the friendship of the King and were even employed by him The earl of Montrose, who was Viceroy in 1605, the Lord Seton, who was Chancellor, the Lord James Elphinstone, were all Catholics at heart But they could not give any Catholic direction to affairs or modify the persecution under the Penal Laws. Of the most influential of them, the Lord Seton, the Jesuits reported:

He publicly professes the State religion, rendering external obedience to the King and the ministers, and goes occasionally, but rarely, to their heretical communion He has also subscribed their confession of faith, without which he would not be able to retain peaceable possession of rank, offices, and estates with which he is so richly endowed. Two or three times a year he comes to Catholic confession and communion with his mother, brothers, sister, and nephews who are better Catholics than himself

Such was the effect of James VI's policy It allowed some Scottish landed gentry to retain in secret the faith which their country had once professed They did so precariously, and the risk, often boldly encountered, was loss of property, of home, sometimes even of liberty. But the condition was that they

should do little for those in the towns who clung to the Catholic religion, little for the priests who tried to minister to these flocks and who were hunted down both by the presbyteries and by the royal troops, nothing at all for those like John Ogilvie who, when pressed, asserted the spiritual authority of the Pope and denied such authority to the King

From the moment that policy was accepted in fact by the Scottish Catholics, Scottish Catholicism became a family and not a national tradition and could do nothing to recall the whole people to the Catholic faith

VI

So the great change between Scotland of the early sixteenth and Scotland of the early seventeenth century was effected. A generation had grown up which had not heard, save in vituperation, of the meritorious character of good works, or of sacramental grace in the Catholic meaning, or of the worship of the Mass. In its place they were indoctrinated with the certainty of election, and it gave them that vigour of decision which some call ruggedness, some obstinacy, and some violence, which made them good working soldiers for many a generation, excellent exploiters of land—colonists in the old sense—and bitter enemies because certain of their own goodness.

Even in the generation which saw the opening of the seventeenth century the essentially fissiparous character of the new Scottish religion showed itself. In its early beginnings its sincere professors were so certain of the exegesis of Calvin that they thought reasonable men could not deny it. When that generation passed, and men found the need of interpreting sixteenth-century as well as first-century documents, and were left without an authoritative interpreter, they differed one from another. Their doctrine of election made each certain he was right, and division followed division, sometimes developing into actual secession. To the ordinary quarrels of political life there were added the more violent quarrels of theology, which could turn honest rebels into fanatics, guardians of order into persecutors.

Apart, however, from the change of a Catholic into a Calvinist

psychology and order of society, there were changes incidental to the revolution in Scotland which occurred more because of the method of that change than from the nature of Calvinism. All the institutions of Scotland had been developed in Catholicism, they were impregnated with its spirit, and many of them were bound up with the economic and social order given by the Catholic Church. A movement so bitterly opposed as Calvinism was to Catholicism could not help but destroy many of these Scottish institutions. This was particularly true of the cultural side of life. The art and the architecture of the country were so expressive of Catholic doctrine, and were so dependent for their upkeep on specific Catholic endowments, that it would have been amazing had they not been destroyed. The fact that the revolution was carried through in so many places by mobs, whether armed and disciplined or not, made it certain that the beauty which generations had laboured to create would be destroyed in a few years.

What was not destroyed perished by neglect. Monasticism had the peculiar virtue that it supported large numbers in comparison with its revenues, and the glory of these numbers was to preserve and beautify their buildings. The monastery was, however, unsuitable as a private house, nor were its revenues sufficient to maintain it as a college unless men adopted a monastic rule. In practice the only use which could be made of a monastery was to sell its stones or roof to a wealthy man for private building. Meanwhile some portion of the revenues was used to support a married minister, who required much more than a single monk, while the rest was used to buy the support of a noble family. As a public building, a thing of architectural beauty, the monastery decayed.

It decayed, too, as a centre of learning. The monastic libraries had been in the widest sense sources of the culture of sixteenth-century Scotland. Some like Kinloss and Melrose and Cupar were famous. But others could at least have been developed. From 1560 the opportunity was lost, such work could be carried out only by a permanent corporation.

Something was done to save the universities in the general

seizure of Church property and its distribution among private citizens The Act which dealt with the lands of the Church ordered the preservation of university property Unfortunately the maintenance of these institutions of learning did not depend simply on the revenues they received directly Many of the benefices of the Chuich, even though they did not officially belong to the universities, had been used to support students All, or almost all, of these were lost to the future learning of Scotsmen But a greater difficulty lay in the curriculum It had been built up by men who were Catholics, the philosophy, the law, the letters had been formed within the Catholic faith and bore in every line the mark of its recent home Calvinism was, if nothing else, too young to have developed a law or a philosophy independent of its theology, and even that was far from being as developed intellectually and systematically as Catholicism It was in the sixteenth century essentially iconoclast and violent, qualities little suited to the conservation and development of learning which is the work of universities None of the intellectual leaders of Scottish Calvinism produced anything of merit in the way of philosophy or even of theology Knox and Buchanan are remembered for their histories and the latter for his verse, but these works scarcely form a basis for the training of the mind. It was not surprising, then, that the generation which followed 1559 saw a practical cessation of the work of the universities, and that when they were revived under royal direction they were mainly for education in pagan letters and Calvinist theology.

There is a legend, however, that this loss was balanced by an improvement in the primary instruction of children. It is believed that the ministers instituted in their parishes, immediately after 1560, those schools which later made Scotland famous. So it is maintained that what was lost in higher learning was made up for by the wider diffusion of at least the rudimentary arts of reading and writing. The records of the sixty years following the change do not lend support to the legend. In 1627, two generations after the decree which suppressed Catholicism, three generations after the general attacks on Catholic institutions

had begun, the central government set up a commission to inquire into the state of the various parishes. Forty-nine of the returns have survived,¹ drawn from different parts of the country. In twelve cases the existence of a school was recorded, in nine of these there was no endowment for it, in thirty cases it was recorded definitely that no school existed. Nor was it a case of provision being slowly made. At Killin and Straillan in Perthshire 'we had a school but for lack of means it dissolved' At Cockpen near Edinburgh 'There was one but for fault of maintenance it deserted' At Kirknewton 'There is a school in the parish but likely to dissolve the next term for want of maintenance' In some cases the actual losses had been directly caused by the beneficiaries of the religious changes of the preceding century. From the parish of Crichton came the plea

A school we have as it is needful but no maintenance Yet there was provided a rent for two, for one Halkerstoun, provost of Crichtoun, doted a tenement of land which belonged to him in heritage to the college of Crichtoun, which lodging was afterwards feued to Umquhill Johne Johnstoun by his brother Mr Adam Johnstoun Provost of Crichtoun, out of the which the teacher of the Grammar had twenty-four marks and the teacher of the music as much Which monies Umquhill Mr Alexander Munro and Mr Richard Kene writer was last possessor thereof, the one being prebendar of the Grammar School, the other of the music school without discharging of the duty Now the Provost and bailies of Edinburgh possess the said lodging sold to them by the heirs of the Umquhill John Johnstoun.

In the case of Logie in Stirlingshire the direct evil result of the Reformation was remembered and set down

There is at the said Kirk an English school but in respect of the multitude of people it is requisite there should be there a better provision for a Grammar School as there was of old, but it decayed by reason it has no provision at all, except a house and yard which now is set in feu by the King to James Forrester of Logic since the Reformation Which is thought cannot by law stand seeing it was once belonging to the Kirk, and there the ministers and school-masters lived and died and it is thought that, seeing the teinds will

¹ *Reports on the state of various Parishes in Scotland, 1627* Printed for the Maitland Club, 1835

be above twenty chalder of corn that of the teinds may be taken a competent provision both for stipend and school

The very returns show that these laments represent the real state of affairs, that little or no education was being given to the children of these parishes. Again and again the elders of the Kirk, men whose forefathers had perhaps been bailiffs of monastic estates and accustomed to the intricacies of medieval accounts, who were the official witnesses of these returns, have to record their witness by making a mark or 'with our hands touching the pen of James Sandelands notary because we cannot write'. Or again at Mordingtoune in Berwickshire, where the number of communicants was a hundred or thereby 'not one of the parish can read nor write except the minister'.

It would perhaps be unfair to blame Calvinism because after two generations of its triumph Scotland had fallen to this level. But in destroying the Catholicism which had nurtured Scotland so long, the men of the sixteenth century had also uprooted institutions and traditions which Calvinists may well have desired to see revived.

THE 'REFORMATION' IN IRELAND

MYLES V RONAN, C.C , M.R.I.A., F.R.S.A.I.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I THE FIRST ATTEMPT TO DESTROY THE CATHOLIC RELIGION	
<i>a</i> Henry VIII's power over the Irish Bishops	565
<i>b</i> Archbishop Browne appointed by Henry	565
<i>c</i> Acts for the King's advantage	569
<i>d</i> Browne the Arch-Reformer	571
<i>e</i> Suppression of religious houses	575
<i>f</i> The Bishops and the Royal Supremacy	577
<i>g</i> 'Order of the Communion'	581
<i>h</i> Book of Common Prayer	584
II. COUNTER-REFORM	588
III THE SECOND ATTEMPT TO DESTROY THE CATHOLIC RELIGION	
<i>a</i> Elizabeth's early policy	592
<i>b</i> Papal and royal episcopal appointments	596
<i>c</i> Results of O'Neill's débâcle	599
<i>d</i> The State Church a failure	603
IV THE IDENTIFICATION OF NATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS RESISTANCE	
<i>a</i> Faith and Fatherland	605
<i>b</i> Irish agents on the Continent	608
<i>c</i> The FitzMaurice expedition	615
<i>d</i> Martyrs for the Faith	618
<i>e</i> No zeal for the 'Reform'	621
V IRELAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES	624

CHAPTER I

THE FIRST ATTEMPT TO DESTROY THE CATHOLIC RELIGION

a. HENRY VIII'S POWER OVER THE IRISH BISHOPS

BEFORE the coming of the Anglo-Normans to Ireland bishops were, as a rule, elected to their sees by the priests and people of each diocese severally. No lay ruler had any right or privilege of presentation or of confirmation. It was not until Henry II, having drawn up the Constitutions of Clarendon for England, sought to impose them upon Ireland that the Irish Church found itself being organized in terms of feudal law. The new procedure in filling vacancies in Irish sees was usually as follows: on the death of the incumbent, the canons sent two of their number to the King to announce the vacancy and to ask for the licence to elect. These messengers having returned to their diocese and announced the licence, the canons proceeded to elect a successor whose name they sent on by their representatives to the King for approval, and the King in turn sent them on to Rome with his recommendation. The Pope's appointment was then approved by the King, and the latter extorted from the bishop-elect the oath of fealty for his temporalities, which were in the King's hands during the vacancy and were swept into the royal exchequer.

During the reign of Henry VIII (1509–47) there were about seventy-three appointments to Irish sees, forty-two of which took place before Henry broke away from the Church (1534). It is not likely that he enjoyed the royal privilege in regard to all the Irish sees, as some of them were outside the sphere of his authority and influence. But he certainly enjoyed it in most of them. This is all the more remarkable when it is borne in mind that, during that period, the Pale, or sphere of English rule, was confined to four shires, Dublin, Meath, Kildare and Oriel (Louth), a district some fifty miles long and twenty broad. He presented bishops to the Pope for sees as far north as Raphoe (Donegal) and as far south as Ross (Cork). There can be no

doubt, therefore, that Henry enjoyed a real power over the Irish Church, and his influence was recognized by Irish Churchmen themselves who had recourse to him to secure provisions to see. It was recognized also by the Holy See, which, in the nine cases in which there is record of his request, appointed the candidate he named. The efforts of England were directed towards destroying all direct intercourse between Ireland and Rome, and as early as 1529 those who exercised it were contemptuously called 'Rome-runners'.

The vast concentration of secular power in Henry's hands and of ecclesiastical power in the hands of Wolsey during his long tenure of legatine authority within the realm led men to acquiesce at a later time in Henry's religious supremacy. But before that time arrived Wolsey sought uncanonically to extend his jurisdiction to Ireland. It was a dangerous move on his part and prepared the way for Henry's absolutism in Church as well as State. But it made no friends in Ireland for Wolsey or for his friend and adviser John Alen, whom he had recommended for the see of Dublin, Vice-Legate and Chancellor. They were both enemies of the great house of Kildare (the biggest factor in the government of Ireland), a feud being created which led a few years afterwards to what may be termed the first religious war in Ireland when the earl's son, Silken Thomas, overran the country 'in behalf of the faith and the Holy See'. The decline of the Kildares and the rise of their old enemies, the Ormondes, made Henry's passage to a complete control of the country easier.

Though accusations regarding Papal provisions to Irish benefices and the wealth of the Irish Church as a source of corruption cannot be taken seriously, yet it will be useful to state the facts of the case. In England provisions of foreigners to benefices had undoubtedly estranged the nobility in great measure from their loyalty to the Holy See, as the practice deprived the lords of patronage and their sons of easy and lucrative livings. In Ireland the only voices heard against Papal provisions were those of a few lords who themselves enjoyed vast patronage of benefices. On the question of corruption in the Irish Church

we have Henry's own recommendation and eulogy of the candidates presented to the Holy See. Whatever may be said of the bishops in their support of Henry's supremacy afterwards, it cannot be said that in other respects they were unworthy occupants. Though they were fond of the honour arising from their office and of the emoluments accruing from the temporalities, yet it cannot be said that they were inordinately wealthy. Compared with their English brethren, many of them were poor indeed. The great earl of Kildare replied, on a famous occasion, to a taunt of Cardinal Wolsey, that if he exchanged kingdoms with the cardinal he would guarantee to gather up more crumbs in one month than twice the revenues of his poor earldom. Ecclesiastical revenues may be said to bear a similar proportion. If we take the Papal taxation as a fairly reliable basis of comparison we find that in this period the normal taxable capacity of all the Irish dioceses taken together was not equal to the sum levied against the opulent incumbent of the single English diocese of Winchester. So that it cannot be said that the Irish Church suffered from the evil influences to which a ponderously wealthy Church might be said to have fallen a prey.

And now Thomas Cromwell, the 'most terrible figure in our history', and the prince of opportunists, appears on the stage. Money seems to have been at the root of his attack on the Church, and Ireland was a fair field for his foraging, though, of course, not so lucrative as England. Nevertheless, he proceeded with his Machiavellian policy and had a useful instrument in George Browne, an Augustinian friar.

b. ARCHBISHOP BROWNE APPOINTED BY HENRY

George Browne, prior of Austin Friars, London, made the acquaintance of the new Lord Chancellor, Thomas Cromwell, in 1532 in connexion with a lease to Cromwell of portion of their property adjoining the friary, and six months later was granted licence to travel beyond the sea. The journey was an eventful one for him, and it is probable that during it he got into touch with continental 'reformers'. At all events, in April 1533 he took his place on the side of the King against the Pope,

and in his Easter sermon in London scandalized the people by asking them to pray for Queen Anne Boleyn. A few months previously he had performed a secret marriage between Henry and Anne. Oxford and Cambridge proceeded to do him honour and conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Cromwell now found him a willing instrument in the new move of holding inquiries into the conduct of English friaries and of forcing the inmates to show their gold and silver and deliver an inventory of their possessions.

As Master-General of the religious houses in England, Browne assumed the role of dictator in doctrinal matters and solemnly threatened with severe punishment the bishops and all others who did not burn all their Bulls obtained from the Holy See, and get new ones from the King, 'seeing that they obeyed the bishop or idol of Rome, who was a limb of the devil'. The leaders of continental Protestantism were invited to London and were consulted principally in relation to the King's authority in spiritual matters, the Sacraments of the Blessed Eucharist and Penance, and the doctrine of Purgatory. Browne's sermon on Purgatory in St Paul's, London, in 1535 gave offence to the Bishop but it pleased Cromwell, who now saw in Browne a useful instrument for the promotion of the 'reform' in that intractable land of Ireland which had yet been untouched by it. Browne was proposed by Henry to the two chapters of Dublin, Christ Church and St Patrick's, who unanimously elected him to the see without any reference to Rome. Evidently not appreciating the significance of the pallium (the symbol of the bond of union between an archbishop and the see of Peter), Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General, conferred it on the newly consecrated Archbishop.

Although the Irish Parliament of 1536 passed the Act constituting the King Supreme Head of the Church in Ireland, yet that Act met with considerable opposition. Nevertheless, it is true to say that had the Spiritual Lords, who were in the majority in the Upper House, been determined in their opposition the Act could not have passed.

Though appeals to Rome had been abolished, yet it is not so

clear that the spiritual lords at this time deprived the Pope of the first-fruits of benefices, &c. There was dissension also in the Council, and what with the activities of Cromwell's spies and the already existing jealousy among the members, the carrying out of the King's wishes was considerably obstructed. In his grand tour through the south and west of Ireland, the Lord-Deputy, Leonard Gray, succeeded in inducing some chieftains and bishops to recognize the King's Supremacy, but on this occasion there is nothing to show that they were asked to renounce 'the Pope's usurped authority'.

Although Browne had not arrived in Dublin in time for the holding of Parliament, he did not, on his arrival, delay his endeavours to induce the clergy to accept the King's Supremacy. He did not find them the pliant instruments he expected. Moreover, the bishops, abbots, and proctors, though they had passed the Act of Supremacy, made a determined stand against the passing of such Bills as the Suppression of Religious Houses, the Twentieths, and First-Fruits of Benefices. So that Browne, in the eyes of Henry and Cromwell, had failed to live up to his English reputation; 'the good opinion', wrote the King to him, 'that we had conceived of you is in manner utterly frustrate'. Cromwell's system of espionage in Ireland was very effective as such, but it defeated its own ends. Productive of suspicion, jealousy, and dissension, it failed to secure the King's 'advantage'. All that Browne could boast of in his reply to Henry was that he had declared unto his hearers 'the true meaning of the only gospel of Christ, utterly despising the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome, being a thing not a little rooted among the inhabitants here'. So far, the only thing he had succeeded in doing for the King's 'advantage' was the granting of the first-fruits by St Patrick's Cathedral, which Henry nobly styled 'the only lantern and light of any godly ecclesiastical rule or order within the land'. The rest, by inference, were a dull lot.

c. ACTS FOR THE KING'S ADVANTAGE

The sixteenth-century attempt to change the religion of the Irish people consisted of a series of efforts to give effect to that

supremacy of the king which the Irish Parliament had voted—and its defeat lay in the fact that the Irish came to understand what that supremacy meant and rejected it in practice. The first step in this twin process was the passing of Acts by the Irish Parliament which the King of England regarded as the corollary of his supremacy. The proctors, acting on the express orders of the bishops in their opposition to the 'Act against the Authority of the Bishop of Rome', were deprived of their votes, and the Act having been passed was enforced by a formidable machine made up of justices of assize, threats of jail, *praemunire*, &c. The Act brought the bishops to their senses, to a realization of what the Royal Supremacy meant. They realized that Ireland was a fief of the Church, that Henry II had based his claim to be lord of Ireland on a Papal Bull, and that Henry VIII was not King of Ireland. They realized, too, that no bishop in union with the Holy See could accept the destruction of all papal authority in the Church of Ireland.

The Acts for the Twentieths of Ecclesiastical Revenues, First-fruits, and the Suppression of the Religious Houses now followed in quick succession. A beginning was made with the suppression of thirteen of these houses, a yearly pension being provided for the chief heads out of the King's 'most excellent charity', the King taking into his own hands all ornaments, jewels, goods, &c. In the matter of faculties and dispensations all appeal to Rome was forbidden on the plea that vast sums of money were annually leaving the country, but the King had no scruple in annexing 50 per cent. of the taxes, granting the Archbishop of Canterbury 33½ per cent., and allowing the remaining 16⅔ per cent or $\frac{1}{6}$ th of the whole to the Chancellor and Clerk of Chancery. That is how Henry interpreted the Act that this Irish money should be divided up for 'the wealth of this realm'.

Two years had now passed since Browne was appointed to his see, and in a most abject letter to Henry (8th January 1538) he had to confess candidly his failure to persuade the clergy of his diocese or province to preach the King's Supremacy, and mentioned the Observants or Reformed Franciscans as the most

obstinate opponents. Having failed to get the clergy to delete the Pope's name from the liturgical books, he appealed for secular aid, and charged the bishops with 'seducing' the people to oppose the King. So that the bishops were so far still firm in their opposition to the King's wishes. The clergy refrained from preaching in their churches where English rule held sway. Indeed, in these parts, all preaching had ceased. But elsewhere the clergy evaded the sheriffs and justices and carried on their ministrations as best they could. The whole 'reform' may be said to have been the work of four men, Lord Butler, son of the earl of Ormonde, Alen, Master of the Rolls, Treasurer Brabazon, and Archbishop Browne. The Lord-Deputy and the judges of the courts had not been persuaded by the preaching of the 'Word of God', as the 'reform' was vaguely styled, even though they admitted in theory the King's Supremacy.

d BROWNE THE ARCH-REFORMER

Hitherto the government had sought to impose its will by financial and judicial measures which would separate the Church in Ireland from the Holy See. Failing in that, George Browne turned to the method of setting up a doctrinal barrier between Ireland and Rome. He now had recourse to drastic measures in the nature of a pastoral instructing the clergy to pray for the King and his officials, and to delete the Pope's name from their books; that confession must be made to God alone, and that prayers for the dead are not to be in the nature of suffrage for the souls in Purgatory. This was the first introduction of purely doctrinal matters and marked an advance in the work of 'reform'. Browne dolefully reported to Cromwell the treatment his pastoral received in the Church of St. Audoen, not a hundred yards from his Cathedral of Holy Trinity. The 'parish priest, according unto his oath, went up into the pulpit, and there began to read them [i.e. Browne's prayers or pastoral]. He had unnethes [scarcely] read a three or four lines, but the parson began the preface, and the quire sang, in so much that the beads were unbidden [the prayers were unpublished].' Browne committed the offender to prison, but would not proceed farther until he

knew the King's mind. Of twenty-eight beneficed clergy all were 'in a manner at the same point with me', that is to say, not one of them obeyed him, and the only remedy for such disobedience he suggested was to remove them from their benefices, otherwise all his preaching and pastorals were useless and the King's Supremacy a dead letter. Many of these priests resigned their benefices rather than acknowledge the Supremacy, but Browne thought it more prudent to consult Cromwell before he would venture to fill them. In truth, he was ever in doubt as to whether his 'reform' was regarded favourably or not by Henry or by Cromwell, for many of the Council, including the Lord-Deputy, did not favour his scheme. The King, fully aware of Gray's great worth as Deputy, was slow to condemn him, and was solely intent on having his Supremacy recognized so that he might fill his coffers with the spoils of the monasteries. Beyond that his notion of 'reform' did not extend. That seems to be the explanation of the strange confusion of ideas and of the dissension among the Irish 'reformers'—Cromwell, with the foreign 'reformers' to support him, bent on the destruction of the Catholic Faith and supporting Browne and his party as much as he dared, and Henry contenting himself with the satisfaction of well-filled coffers.

Browne was by no means averse from lining his purse, and named his price to Basnet, the new dean of St. Patrick's, for confirmation to his deanery. The £200 (about £3,000, 1914 value) was paid down before Browne pronounced his approval. He himself had promised £250 to Lord Rochford, Anne Boleyn's brother, for his influence in having him appointed to Dublin. In the event of Henry's proceeding with the suppression of the religious houses, Browne mentioned his own desired share of the spoils, namely, the possessions of the Convent of Grace Dieu in north County Dublin.

Not only was the Lord-Deputy opposed to Browne's system of 'reform', calling him a 'poll-shorn knave friar', but even his fellow Englishman, Edward Staples, bishop of Meath, who had accepted the Royal Supremacy, bearded Browne in one of the city churches (St Audoen's), warning his hearers against

'seditious and false preachers' who were questioning texts of Scripture A regular battle of sermons between Staples and Browne ensued which became the subject of a royal inquiry, much to the discomfiture of Browne, whom Staples accused 'that he doth abhor the Mass'. Staples, however, was a strong supporter of the Royal Supremacy, which he admitted was making no headway, and proposed, as the only way of making it successful, to have the bishops' Papal Bulls called in and royal letters issued instead Thus the issue would be knit between King and Pope A trial of strength was made in the diocese of Clonfert in Connacht, the Pope appointing Roland Burgh and the King appointing Richard Nangle, Provincial of the Augustinians in Ireland Nangle was expelled ignominiously and returned to Browne This was not the only sign of failure, as Cowley, Master of the Rolls, reported to Cromwell that the Pope had appointed to other vacant sees and that a more general recourse was made daily to Rome than in times past So that any ground that had been lost in 1536 by the hasty acceptance of the Supremacy was regained by 1538

The destruction of images and relics now began to occupy the minds of the four promoters of the 'Reform', Browne, Butler, Brabazon, and Alen On a tour in Meath with the Lord-Deputy, they refused to enter St. Mary's Abbey, Trim, where stood a celebrated shrine of Our Lady, but it was reported to Cromwell by Alen's brother that 'my Lord-Deputy, very devoutly kneeling before Her, heard three or four Masses'. Browne apologetically informed Cromwell that he never attempted 'to pluck down Our Lady of Trim, with other places of pilgrimage, as the Holy Cross (Cashel) and such like . . . although my conscience would right well serve me to oppress such idols But undoubted they be the adversaries of God's word.' It seems clear, however, that Browne had shortly before August 1538 started on his iconoclastic campaign, beginning with the burning of the relics and of the *Baculus Jesu*, or St Patrick's Staff, venerated in Christ Church, Dublin, for over 350 years. Instead of the images in the cathedral, Browne had the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments in English

displayed on the walls in ornamental lettering and in gilded frames. This action seems not to have pleased the King, who 'commanded that images should be set up again, and honoured, and worshipped, as much as ever they were'.

Browne's next move was to request Cromwell to have a Master of Faculties appointed, upon which subject he had often opened his 'poor mind' to him. The dispensations, he promised, would be of monetary value to the King. Two years had elapsed since the passing of the Act of Faculties and yet no Master had been appointed. It is clear that there was no work for him, and that Browne's boast was merely a gesture to show how zealous he was for the 'reform'. Indeed he was constantly apologetic for his occupancy of the see of Dublin, for he knew not how he stood with Cromwell and the King, whose aims were so different and so disconcerting. But he was careful, by promises of valuable hawks and other presents, to strive to keep the King and his wily counsellor in good humour with him. He had now succeeded in winning over Staples and Rawson, prior of the Hospitallers of Kilmainham, who along with most of the Council of Ireland declared to Cromwell, in January 1539, that for the 'abolishing of the Bishop of Rome's usurped authority, and extinguishing of idolatry, we have well begun therein already, and to our power shall persevere with all industry and diligence'.

To push forward this new phase of religion in the country, Browne and three other members of the Council journeyed southwards, combining the work of the assizes with their 'reform' campaign. To provide 'a mirror' to all 'to live truly' they 'hanged a friar in his habit'. With all the power they could command they ordered the bishops of Munster to appear before them at Clonmel. In all, two archbishops, those of Tuam and Cashel, and eight bishops obeyed the summons and took the Oath of Supremacy before Lord Chancellor Alen in January 1539. There is no mistaking the meaning of this oath—it repudiated the Pope utterly and denied him any authority in Ireland. It was sufficiently precise to deter any bishop in union with the Holy See from accepting it, and the fact that Pope Paul III

shortly afterwards appointed other bishops to some of these sees bears out this view. It is important, however, to note that no other doctrinal point was in question. Yet it must be said that this Clonmel meeting marks the real breaking-point of the Church in Ireland. Though some historians have endeavoured to throw doubt on the authenticity of the report of these proceedings, yet there is no valid reason for such doubt, as Lord Chancellor Alen, whatever his faults may have been, was not one to lend his name to a spurious document. Shortly after the Clonmel meeting Browne conceived the ingenious plan of appointing Irish-speaking bishops to the vacant sees in the Irishry who would preach the 'word of God' to the natives in their own tongue, though the Irish language had been previously condemned by Act of Parliament. Browne hoped thereby to convince Henry and Cromwell that he was doing his best for the 'reform'.

e. SUPPRESSION OF RELIGIOUS HOUSES

In all countries where the Reformation was brought about one of the early steps was the destruction of religious houses. It had the double advantage of providing the secular governments with funds for their campaign and of removing centres of Catholic learning. But before the Council in Ireland could proceed with the suppression of religious houses the way had to be prepared for the recognition of the Supremacy. As the Supremacy had had but a poor response, reasons were sought for the justification of the suppression. Between 1536 and 1539 a good deal of justifying of the threat was resorted to so that irresponsible talk might provide an excuse. Browne, the arch-reformer, could only accuse the 'Romish Orders' of being 'bulwarks of Popery'. The royal commission, 3 February 1539, based its order on this: that 'the praise of God and the welfare of man' were not regarded in the religious houses, and the regulars and nuns were addicted to 'superstitious ceremonies', 'pernicious worship of idols', and the 'pestiferous doctrines of the Roman Pontiff'. The real reason of the suppression was not to be found in any notable or general abuses but in the King's need

of money, and in his greed for plate and jewels, and in the hope that the monastic lands, leased out to Anglo-Normans, might be made the nucleus of the increase of the royal power in Ireland

A beginning had been made in 1537 with thirteen houses, just to see how the venture would be taken by those concerned. No rising in protest ensued—organization on that line did not take place even at the general suppression—and there were always sufficient land-grabbers with power behind them to welcome fresh accessions to their possessions, and thus lay the foundations for the titles and property which they handed down to their successors in the 'Irish' nobility. Henry laid aside his anti-iconoclastic attitude, and ordered the commissioners to inquire if 'there were any notable images or reliques, to which the simple people of the said lord the King were wont to assemble superstitiously and as vagrants to walk and roam in pilgrimage, or else to lick, kiss, or honour, contrary to God's honour, and the same to break up and remove and so to carry off entirely with all the things pertaining, annexed, and adjoined thereto, they should utterly abolish them, that no such mockeries should from thenceforward be visited in the said land or dominion of the aforesaid lord the King' The reason of Henry's change of attitude is given later in the order, wherein inquiry was to be made as to plate, jewels, ornaments, the value of divers vessels of gold and silver, jewels, and principal ornaments of the shrines, which were to be reserved 'for the advantage of the lord the King in great necessity' Considering how documents of those days concealed rather than expressed their real purpose, it is striking that Henry and his advisers should have been so explicit about the reservations to his Majesty. Cromwell was evidently making an *ad misericordiam* appeal to the members of the Irish Council in favour of the King.

On no account, however, was it to be inferred that there was any compulsion in the suppression, on the contrary, it was to be a 'free surrender' or rather free compulsion Consistency did not count—only appearances. Even these were brushed aside where the profit was considerable. Lord-Deputy Gray recommended six houses in the Pale to stand, as they were centres of

education principally for the children of the gentry, but although the King made a parade of his love of culture he preferred the profits accruing from the suppression. In the Pale alone the 'receipt of money from the price of jewels and ornaments found on profane images' amounted to £326 (about £4,900, 1914 value),¹ and from the sale of goods and chattels belonging to the houses of the Pale, £1,710 (£25,650). The total possessions of the religious houses of the Dublin diocese in various parts of the country amounted to about £39,345 (1914 value). We have no effective means of ascertaining the amount derived from the other dioceses in Ireland. All these possessions were swept into the King's hands and leased to the powerful Anglo-Norman gentry. It is unnecessary to enter into the details of how the goods and chattels, sacred and profane, were sold by auction or by private treaty by the commissioners at the suppression of each house severally; but it is worth noting that the bells were objects of great concern and lively bidding, and that lead roofs were melted down into 'sows' and sent to England for the King's use. The priors and abbots and many monks of the larger houses were granted pensions by the King's Grace, but the rest, monks and friars, were turned out of their cloister and sent adrift on the world penniless. The only religious house in the diocese of Dublin which escaped suppression was the Convent of Holy Trinity, or Christ Church, occupied by the Regular Canons of the Arrouasian Rule. At the request of the Lord-Deputy and Council and of the Mayor and Citizens of Dublin, it was allowed to stand by changing its clothing and rule, namely, by becoming a secular chapter.

f. THE BISHOPS AND THE ROYAL SUPREMACY

So far, the Kings of England had been content with the title 'Lord of Ireland' which was based on Pope Adrian IV's Bull to Henry II, by which the land of Ireland was granted to the King as to a feudal lord under the overlordship of the Pope.² As early

¹ The value of money in Henry VIII's time is generally taken as about 15 times the pre-War or 1914 value.

² Some historians do not regard the Bull as authentic. For fresh arguments in favour of its authenticity see O'Doherty ('Rome and the Anglo-Norman Invasions

as 1537, however, Alen had recommended a change of title, 'King in Ireland', as a completion of the title 'Head of the Church of Ireland'. It was considered that the new title would overawe the Irish, wean them from their allegiance and loyalty to the Pope by depriving him of all right to the country, and thus break the remaining link between Ireland and the Holy See. At the same time Alen candidly admitted that so far the King's Supremacy in the Irish Church was not acknowledged. At a Parliament held in Dublin, the new title was conferred (26th June 1541), two archbishops and twelve bishops being mentioned as having been present. The Act was so worded that it might appear that it was not Parliament that granted the title but that the Kings of England as lords of Ireland had always enjoyed all authority royal. In order to give 'memorable solemnity' to the title 'a Solemn Mass was performed by the Archbishop of Dublin, in the presence of the Lord-Deputy (Sentleger), the Earls of Ormonde and Desmond, and others of the nobility, in their Parliament robes, and of several of the bishops and clergy'. After the Mass, 'the Act was proclaimed in presence of the assembly and *Te Deum* sung with great joy and gladness to all men. The same Sunday great bonfires were made in the city, wine set in the streets, great feasting in their houses, with a goodly sort of guns.' So ran the official account of this joyous celebration. But no one takes literally such an account dressed for the royal palate. Though many of the Irish chieftains were present at the passing of the Act, which was read in the combined assembly of Lords and Commons in Irish, yet we cannot associate the people with the deeds of their chiefs, or the clergy with the deeds of the bishops. On the other hand, how

of Ireland'), *Ir. Eccl. Rec.* xlii, pp. 131-45. Adrian's successor, Alexander III, in September 1172, wrote to Henry II, to the Kings and Princes of Ireland, and the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland assembled at the Synod of Cashel (1172), in response to their letters, to the effect 'the kingdom of Ireland' was 'confirmed' to Henry 'and his heirs kings and lords of Ireland for ever' (Ronan, 'The Diocese of Dublin', *I.E.R.* xlii, pp. 493-7).

As to Henry's lordship of Ireland, the acknowledgement of his superior power was, at the most, but an act of personal submission on the part of those Irish chiefs who made it and conferred neither under feudal nor Irish custom any right or dominion over their clans or territories. However, Henry and his successors exceeded their rights under feudal lordship and by imposing on the Irish unsupportable services, and by depriving them of their lands, thereby enriching their own followers, left Ireland no choice but to resist aggression.

long these Irish bishops and chiefs continued their allegiance to the 'King of Ireland' is quite another matter. Nevertheless, it has to be said that fourteen bishops and many Irish chiefs were present at the passing of the Act, and that about twenty Irish chiefs renounced the 'Pope's usurpations' and owned the King's Supremacy by indenture. No doubt the violence of the military expeditions against them and the fate of the Geraldines terrorized the chiefs.

The bishops were now called upon to deliver up their Papal Bulls and to receive the King's Briefs instead. The oath that the new incumbents were ordered to take was a clear, unequivocal mandate to renounce utterly all Papal authority. There is, therefore, no difference between the two classes of bishops. Of the bishops already in possession of their sees some fourteen or fifteen out of about thirty surrendered their Papal Bulls. Their orthodoxy cannot be maintained. That this was so is seen in the appointment in 1539 by Pope Paul III of Robert Wauchope to the administratorship of the see of Armagh occupied by George Cromer, who had been accused of heresy at Rome. There is nothing to show that Cromer did more than accept the supremacy. But as Primate of All Ireland his action was a grave scandal to the Irish Church. Wauchope's appointment was merely temporary—until the archbishop should purge himself.

Wauchope considered the time ripe for bringing the bishops and chiefs to their senses, for encouraging them to rally round their people, present a united front to Henry, and thereby remove the stain from the Irish Church. For this purpose he obtained in 1540 from his friend St. Ignatius two of his companions, Paschal Broet and Alphonso Salmeron, to come amongst them. Their visit, however, was a comparative failure, due to the Irish chiefs' fear of conferring with the envoys. The angry face of Henry VIII was like a nightmare to the chiefs. Even Con O'Neill, prince of Tyrone, practically the only chief who had not sworn to the Royal Supremacy, held aloof, although in a brief Paul III sent to him in 1541 he is called 'a Champion of God and of the Roman Church and of the Catholic religion'. As the Jesuits had been commanded to

return if they were not received favourably, if they saw their task hopeless, or their lives in danger, they withdrew to Scotland. Having sent their report, they were ordered to return to Rome. The Jesuit mission, however, was successful in this, that it stiffened the backs of the Irish people and revived in them the spirit of prayer and the love for the spiritual exercises of their religion, clergy and people, ignoring the royal bishops, freely applied to Rome for faculties and dispensations, which were granted gratis. Rome ever remained the centre of their thoughts and of their religious life. Besides the secular clergy, who ministered to them as best they could in secret, the people were heartened by the austerity and self-denial of the friars who journeyed amongst them preaching the Word of God as St. Patrick and his companions had done over a thousand years previously. The people, therefore, remained untouched by this wave of Royal Supremacy. Though in England Anglicanism was regarded as the outcome of national independence, in Ireland it was the badge of political conquest.

In all we can trace about twenty-two bishops (out of about thirty) who accepted the Supremacy during Henry's reign, some of whom had been appointed by the Pope in opposition to Henry's mandate, so that only about eight Papal bishops at a given time were definitely opposed to the King's Supremacy. Yet it may be said that most of the bishops who submitted were indeed lukewarm for the 'reform'. Two factors operated towards this extraordinary defection among the majority of the Irish bishops. the loyalty of the chiefs to Henry and the control of the temporalities. Without those helps they did not visualize how the office of bishop could be maintained. The apostolic spirit was sadly deficient. 'No benefice, no ministration' seemed to have been the general rule. One of the worst examples in the hierarchy was that set by George Dowdall, prior of Ardee, who was appointed by Henry to Armagh on the death of Cromer in 1543. It seems that, on the suppression of his friary, Dowdall was promised the see of Armagh by the King. Later, however, Dowdall made good, and none was more determined in his opposition to the 'reform' than he.

Not satisfied with the plunder of the religious houses, Henry viewed the possessions of the dignities and prebends of St Patrick's Cathedral as a valuable field for further plunder. He died, however, before he had accomplished his design, but his son, Edward VI, carried it out, imitating his royal father in ordering an inventory of the plate, ornaments, and jewels of the cathedral which were to be sent to the Treasurer of the Mint at Bristol. The other possessions that fell into the King's hands amounted to about £20,550 (*1914 value*). A bright idea now struck Browne why not convert St Patrick's into a university? Indeed, this idea seems to have been a deciding factor in the compliance of the prebendaries with the dissolution of their ancient cathedral. But it never materialized, though over and over again the need of such an educational establishment at the centre of the government was strongly represented by the 'reform' party, so that 'by learning and example' the people might be brought to a 'knowledge of the King' and 'obedience of his laws', and 'that barbarous nation from evil to good'. Another part of Browne's plan was to erect the long-delayed Court of Faculties. It was only in 1547 that the commission for setting it up was issued, and the scale of fees was so high that they were calculated to bring a good revenue into the royal coffers.

Notwithstanding his display of zeal, Browne had raised about him a hornets' nest, what with alienating lands of his see and granting leases to his children, as well as neglecting the preaching of the 'Word of God', and allowing a Scot who contemned the Mass to preach in his cathedral. To extricate himself from the effect of the Scot's words, Browne had to undertake the disagreeable burden of preaching and to condemn the Scot's tirade against the Mass, though Browne himself had no love for the Mass at the time.

g 'ORDER OF THE COMMUNION'

While Henry VIII lived his servants could not safely alter the worship of the Mass or interfere with the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Altar. In consequence, practically nothing had been

done so far in the matter of changing the liturgical books and the services in Ireland, with the exception of Browne's early attempt to erase the Pope's name from them. The year 1548 saw a decided effort at upheaval. Henry being dead, Cranmer had a Bill passed in 1547 'for the most Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ' to be taken under both kinds, though this was against Henry's Six Articles. But early in 1548 the 'Book of Reformation' or 'The Order of the Communion' in English was ordered to be appended to the Latin Mass, to come into force on Easter Day, 1st April. In Dublin the 'Book' was not received in time for Easter, indeed not for many months afterwards. But the first reception of the new Order was a painful reminder to Staples of Meath that the people understood the 'Sacrament of the Altar' in a different sense from that which Staples endeavoured to preach to them. His experience convinced him that, from being 'the best beloved man' in his diocese, he was now 'the worst beloved that ever came here'.

'The Order of the Communion' which marked the transition from the Latin Liturgy to the First Book of Common Prayer existed side by side with the Catholic Liturgy in Dublin for three years. In it some changes were abruptly made, notably, Communion under both kinds, but others, such as General Confession before Communion, were adroitly insinuated. Its phraseology was so ingeniously constructed that doctrinal points were open to different interpretations. To create doubt and dissension seems to have been its principal object, as a preparation for the further 'reform' to which the King openly alluded. That this document did give rise to a great deal of dissension amongst the clergy and lawyers of Dublin there can be no doubt, for the 'Order' shows that its framers had ceased to regard the Mass as a sacrifice. The Blessed Sacrament is called a high mystery, and though Christ is present and partaken in it, flesh and blood, yet the communicant is said to feed on Christ merely 'spiritually'. The effects of Holy Communion, according to Catholic theology, were purposely omitted. As to absolution of sins before Communion, the power is represented as given to the Church and not to the individual priest, and the priest, in the name of the Church,

pronounces the general absolution. Auricular confession is optional, and is really permitted for the sake of satisfying one's mind and of dispelling doubt and scruples. Every one is to act according to his conscience, and no one is to murmur at another, whether he or she seeks individual or merely general absolution. Clearly, Penance as a Sacrament was deliberately ruled out.

The people were commanded not to murmur at this 'Order' but to remain quiet and peaceful, as the King, encouraged by its reception, would effect other 'reforms' in due time. They were to trust to his judgement, zeal, and discernment, and though private judgement are allowed to him and his advisers, the people were not permitted private opinion lest 'any unseemly and ungodly diversity' might ensue. So that at the very foundation of the 'Reformation' the rock upon which it was built—private judgement—was rent asunder. Such was the beginning of the 'reform' in regard to the Mass and the Sacraments. The framers of it knew whither they were tending, but the people, as became 'loving subjects', should await the result of the concerted wisdom and zeal of Cranmer and his foreign theologians. In all this there was no claim on the part of the 'reformers' that they were restoring the ancient faith and Church of St Patrick. This claim was left for modern Irish Protestants. Indeed the ancient Irish Church was despised. The new 'Church of Ireland' was made in England of continental material, and must stand or fall as the product of that combination of rather heterogeneous elements.

Strange to say, though the Mass was condemned because it was said in Latin, and the English scriptures and prayers were so much extolled, yet the newly made service or 'Order of Communion' was commanded to be translated into Latin so that the priests of Ireland who knew no English might be fully informed of the new doctrines. As the English bishops were giving way on the doctrine of the Real Presence, and the true interpretation of the 'Order of 1548' was being promulgated, Lord-Deputy Bellingham sought to spread the change of doctrine in Ireland. But he met with strong opposition from Dowdall of Armagh, Primate of All Ireland and King's bishop. This was the first real note of refusal to accept the new doctrines, and whatever may be

said against the Bishops for their acquiescence in the King's supremacy and their renunciation of Papal authority, yet on the question of the Real Presence nearly all were Catholic to the core. The exceptions were chiefly foreigners. Henceforth Catholicism asserts itself in Ireland, and Bellingham simply deplores the great want of 'good shepherds here to illuminate the hearts of the flock of Christ with his most true and infallible word'. The remedy for all this was, as Lord Protector Somerset wrote to Bellingham, in his Majesty's wish that the Deputy should take the resignations of such bishops as would voluntarily resign and recommend others in their places. But though Bellingham was exalted by Alen as 'the best man of war that ever he had seen in Ireland', and though Auditor Brasier told Somerset that 'there was never Deputy in that realm that went the right way, as he doth, both for the setting forth of God's Word to His honour and to the wealth of the King's Highness' subjects', yet he was unable to cope with the opposition to his 'reforms'. Sentleger, who succeeded him in the deputyship, had to confess that he never saw so much disorder in the country, 'and there these three years no kind of divine service, neither communion, nor yet other service, having but one sermon made in that space, which the Bishop of Meath made, who had [received] so little reverence at that time as he had no great haste since to preach there'. On the other hand, the priests continued to offer the Holy Sacrifice in secret places whenever English pikes prevented their services in public.

h BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

The 'Order of the Communion' was only a temporary expedient; a bigger scheme of 'reform' was in preparation, namely, the First Book of Common Prayer. Sentleger was ordered to set forth the Church service in English, according to the royal ordinances, in all places where it was possible to muster a congregation who understood that language. Elsewhere the words were to be translated truly into the despised Irish language, until such time as the people were brought to a knowledge of English. Before the proclamation of the new Liturgy was

made to the people, it appears that Sentleger called together the archbishops, bishops, and clergy on the 1st March 1551 to acquaint them of the King's order as well as of the opinions of the bishops and clergy of England who had given consent to it Dowdall refused to accept it, and, with some of his suffragan bishops, left the assembly. Then, it is said, Sentleger handed the Order to Browne who, standing up, received it and submitted to it. Some weeks afterwards, it was proclaimed by Sentleger, and the new Liturgy was celebrated in English on Easter Sunday, 29th March, in Christ Church in presence of the Lord-Deputy, the Archbishop, and the Mayor and Bailiffs of Dublin, Browne preaching the sermon.

From all this it would be incorrect to infer that Sentleger was opposed to the Catholic Mass, or, more correctly, to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. We were the first to point out that the reasons for Sentleger's sudden recall from the Lord-Deanship in 1551 were his support of the doctrine and the adverse reports of his action by Browne. A manuscript in the Public Record Office, London, entitled *Booke oute of Ireland*, which we published *in extenso*, and which is a collection of extracts from the Fathers of the Church and medieval theologians in defence of this doctrine, was compiled at the order of Sentleger by a clerical friend of his. The Lord-Deputy showed it to Browne, who took it home to peruse it and afterwards forwarded it to Lord Protector Warwick because he was horrified to find it 'so poisoned to maintain the Mass with Transubstantiation and other naughtiness (as at no time I have seen such a summary of scriptors collected to establish that idolatry), clean contrary the sincere meaning of the Word of God, and the King's most godly proceedings'. Moreover, on the occasion of the first celebration of the Liturgy, referred to above, Sentleger made his Mass offerings at the altar as of old before the congregation to the delight of the 'papists' and the consternation of the 'professors of God's Word'. According to Browne, Sentleger's promulgation of the English Liturgy was a mere sham, and his advice to Dowdall to return home lest any harm should come to him for his refusal to accept that Liturgy also gave great offence to Browne.

Browne immediately petitioned that he himself should be appointed Primate of All Ireland instead of Dowdall and receive the revenues of Armagh so that he might be able to continue the hospitality he was expected to show to the King's officials. Dowdall was indeed deprived of his title, which was given to Browne, but the emoluments were granted to Goodacre, the new royal archbishop of Armagh. Dowdall had meanwhile quitted the country (before August 1551) not, as some historians have handed down, because he was deprived of his title—he was gone before that happened—but because he refused to be bishop where the Holy Mass was abolished. Dowdall's attitude—and it was typical—makes one pause and ask what was really his motive in accepting the see from Henry a few years previously. Would he have continued an Anglican Catholic—that is, in Catholicism without the Pope—if the other doctrines had been untouched? We think not. We rather think that Dowdall and the other bishops who acted similarly were greedy for honour and emoluments and were overawed by Henry. Some writers have suggested that they were rather time-servers, and regarded Henry's action as a passing phase, hoping that eventually all would come out right. That may be an explanation of their action, but it does not excuse it. To the steadfastness of the bishops and priests of Ireland, however, at this critical period may be attributed the utter failure of the new liturgy.

The coming of Sir James Crofts to Ireland in 1551 as the new Lord-Deputy coincided with increased activity of the government in the 'reform' especially in the promulgation of the Second Book of Common Prayer and the appointment of married men to vacant sees. The First Book of 1549 had been arranged with the express object of not offending Catholic belief too glaringly. Quite another spirit pervaded its revised form, known as the Second Book of 1552, which used the knife unsparingly on 'unreformed' doctrines and ceremonies. The First Book removed all notion of the Mass as a Sacrifice, the Second Book discarded the doctrine of the Real Presence. This whole question will doubtless be fully treated in the section on the 'Reformation' in England. It will suffice to say here that only two Sacraments

remained in the new Creed, namely, Baptism and Holy Communion, and that the five others were considered as *quasi sacraments* or ceremonies. One point of importance must be emphasized, and that is the question of the new ordinal for the consecration of bishops and the ordination of priests. By the use of that ordinal all consecrations and ordinations were invalid. But it was not ordered for use in Ireland either by the King or by the Irish Parliament—in fact, it was not authorized by that Parliament until the second year of Elizabeth—and yet Goodacre of Armagh and Bale were consecrated in Dublin in 1553 according to its ceremonies. Though Browne and Goodacre favoured the Roman Ordinal, as the only legitimate liturgy for Ireland, and probably because they doubted the validity of the new one, yet Bale insisted on the latter, which was used. And so the consecration was performed, says Bale, ‘there being no tumult among the people [sic] and every man, saving the priests, being well contented’. According to Bale, also, Browne seemed quite a stranger to the new ceremony of Communion—indeed Browne seems to have been a stranger to any form of Communion. Moreover, though Browne and his assistants were vested in copes and albs, and bore pastoral staves, as prescribed by the Ordinal of 1550, yet Bale, in accordance with the Ordinal of 1552, declined to assume those trappings of Popery. Differences on this very question caused a great deal of dissension among the royal bishops under Elizabeth.

The case of Bale may be taken as a typical one when he sought to impose the ‘reform’ in his diocese of Ossory. On the occasion of his first sermon in the cathedral of Kilkenny, clergy and people flocked to hear what this new bishop sent to them had to say on the Gospel. He states that he preached that the people were to trust in no man’s prayers, or merits, but only in Christ’s, ‘the right invocation of God’, and then continues in his usual scurrilous style:¹

... and helpers I found none among my prebendaries and clergy, but

¹ Even the Protestant ecclesiastical historian, Mant, admits that Bale ‘with an uncommon warmth of temperament, allowed himself in the use of an unbecoming coarseness, and even grossness, of expression, in speaking of those who had incurred his displeasure’

adversaries a great number . But when once I sought to destroy the idolatries, and dissolve the hypocrites' yokes, then followed angers, slanders, conspiracies, and, in the end, the slaughter of men. Much ado I had with the priests, for that I had said among other, that the white gods [the Sacred Hosts] of their making, such as they offered to the people to be worshipped, were no gods, but idols, and that their prayers for the dead procured no redemption to the souls departed, redemption of souls being only in Christ, of Christ, and by Christ . Much were the priests offended also, for that I had in my preachings willed them to have wives of their own [we omit Bale's scurrilous insinuations] well, the truth is, I could never yet, by any godly or honest persuasion, bring any of them to marriage

Scarcely six months had elapsed after this tirade on Catholic doctrine and practice when Edward VI died and was succeeded by Mary. The complete change in officialdom becomes at once apparent and is indicative of this belief in the 'reform' as a passing phase to which we have already alluded. It took a fortnight for the news of Edward's death to reach Kilkenny. Immediately, says Bale, the priests set the example among the townspeople of great rejoicing, and Lord Howth and Lord Mountgarret resorted on the morrow to the cathedral and ordered the Mass in honour of St. Anne to be celebrated 'Mark', says Bale, 'the blasphemous blindness and wilful obstinacy of this beastly papist' Bale had shortly afterwards to seek safety in flight from his cathedral city. Thus Mary's accession defeated, for the time being, any hope of success expected from the Second Book of Common Prayer, and the 'reform' was acknowledged as a dismal failure.

CHAPTER II

COUNTER-REFORM

IT will be useful to follow Bale in his account of what happened on Mary's accession. 'On the 20th day of August was the Lady Mary with us at Kilkenny proclaimed queen of England, France, and Ireland, with the greatest solemnity that could be devised, of processions, musters, and disguisings [pageants] all the noble captains and gentlemen thereabout being present.' He then describes how the priests had boldly endeavoured to compel him to put on mitre and cope, to carry his crozier, and join in the procession. This he refused, and courageously repaired to the market cross with the New Testament in hand, but the priests ordered two clerics to carry the mitre and crozier in front of him, much to his disgust. Evidently, priests and people wished to put him to shame, but he succeeded in delivering his discourse on Protestant doctrines which the priests that evening called upon him to substantiate and argue with them. The rejoicings continued for a few days, consisting principally of the public representations in the market square of the ancient Mystery Plays which had been such a powerful factor in the religious life of the people and which had ceased since the beginning of the 'reform'.

The Council that had carried out the proclamation of the Edwardine Liturgy was now commanded to proclaim Mary 'Supreme Head of the Churches of England and Ireland'. The proclamation was read in Dublin and in the other cities and towns in Ireland. The Mass was restored and Mary's Lord-Deputies were inaugurated into their offices with the full Catholic ceremonial of ancient days. Indeed, Mary, in her orders for consecration of new bishops, ordered the existing bishops such as Browne, and presumably his suffragans, to carry out the rite according to the Roman Ordinal. Whether she adverted to the fact that these bishops were married men does not appear; she simply took the occupants of the sees for the present as she found them. Very soon, however, she issued a commission to

Bishops Dowdall, Walsh of Meath, and Leverous of Kildare to restore the ancient religion and to deprive the married bishops of their sees Cardinal Pole, Papal legate, delegated Dowdall and Walsh to deal with the Irish bishops who had accepted the Supremacy, and to absolve them provided they abjured their errors. Browne followed Bale into exile across the seas and, strange to relate, scarcely anything is known of his subsequent history But one of the most extraordinary acts of Mary was her appointment of Hugh Curwen, her chaplain, to the see of Dublin. He was a weak character in each of the several roles he attempted to play An upholder of the Supremacy and an abettor of Henry's marriage with Anne Boleyn, he seems to have deceived Mary His worthless character will appear later Two matters that Mary set right were the restoration of St Patrick's Cathedral and of the Hospitallers of Kilmainham Though she wished to restore religious houses, yet, on account of the opposition of those who had benefited by their suppression, she contented herself with restoring but one in Ireland

The only other event of importance during Mary's reign was the conferring by Pope Paul IV on her and her consort of the title of Queen and King of Ireland But, as the Irish people resisted the lordship of Henry II, so they resisted the sovereignty of Mary The religious question did not obscure the issue The Irish chiefs, growing bolder under a Catholic sovereign, asserted loudly and plainly 'that Englishmen had no right to Ireland'. Mary, however, (or perhaps her officials) was just as strong in her determination to quell any opposition to her jurisdiction. The result was that Ireland was in a more unsettled condition than it had been for many years One great thing that Mary did before her short reign was ended was that she renounced her title 'Head of the Church' and restored the authority of the Pope. Though a few appointments to Irish sees had been made by her or her officials under that title it is quite clear that these were not the result of any desire of hers to assume such a role, but of the want of time or opportunity to settle those matters—in other words, they were merely official or temporary.

Mary did all she could to efface her father's and brother's anti-Roman policy, but no persecution of Protestants occurred in Ireland. Indeed, it is said that many people fled from England in order to share the immunity enjoyed by the small Protestant community in Dublin.

CHAPTER III

THE SECOND ATTEMPT TO DESTROY THE CATHOLIC RELIGION

a. ELIZABETH'S EARLY POLICY

WHEN Queen Mary of England died her half-sister Elizabeth succeeded and almost at once began to destroy the Catholic Church in the land she ruled. Similar instructions were given to the English officials in Ireland. Though the conditions were no longer what they had been under Henry VIII, Mary's reign had been all too short to pull the Church in Ireland out of the confusion and disorganization of the reigns of Henry and Edward. The ministrations of the clergy to the people had suffered in consequence, and the people in many places were bewildered not only by new arrivals, but by old survivals in the persons of compliant 'Vicars of Bray'. The country, it is well to remember, had seen three changes of religion within the short term of twelve years. One of the most pliant compromisers was Curwen of Dublin, who submitted to all that Elizabeth's officials requested of him. It can be said without any hesitation that five of the Marian bishops accepted both Supremacy and Uniformity and that two others accepted at least the Supremacy. The five belonged to dioceses in Leinster and Munster which were more or less under English rule, and the two belonged to Tuam and Clonfert in the west, which were under the earl of Clanrickard. For all practical purposes it may be taken that the bishops, in their dealings with the Sovereign, as a rule followed the lead of the local lay lord. This was apparent in the unseemly haste with which the bishops took the Oath of Supremacy under Henry VIII. Under Elizabeth, however, the lords as a rule remained firm, neither being asked to take, nor of themselves taking the Oath of Supremacy, except in places under the direct control of the English government. Thus the bishops, following their lords, were content with taking the oath of fealty and allegiance to the Queen and her deputy when the occasion demanded it.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that even in Dublin at the Parliament of 1560 the Supremacy passed without great opposition. As a matter of fact, the Parliament was dissolved almost immediately 'by reason of aversion to the Protestant religion, and their ecclesiastical government', and only by fraud was the Act passed at a subsequent session. So sinister were the whole proceedings that no reliable account of them has yet been discovered. But though Parliament might pass the Act it had no machinery outside a limited area to enforce it, and so the people went on as before, having their Mass and ministrations according to the circumstances obtaining in the particular area. To say that because only two bishops were deprived of their sees, namely, Meath and Kildare, the rest of the bishops acquiesced in the Supremacy is to ignore historical facts. And yet this argument has been used by Protestant historians even down to the present day. Elizabeth immediately provided her own bishops to the two sees, and had Walsh of Meath thrown into prison. Leverous of Kildare quietly departed from his diocese to take up the position of Catholic schoolmaster in Limerick under the patronage of the earl and countess of Desmond.

Meanwhile Pope Pius IV appointed an archbishop to Armagh and an Apostolic Nuncio to Ireland. The chief objects of the Nuncio, Father Wolf, S.J., were to propose suitable bishops for vacant sees, to reform the clergy, to reorganize religious houses, to encourage the nobles and the bishops in their loyalty to the Holy See, and last, but not least, to erect colleges and academies for the training of the clergy and the education of youth. It was an ambitious programme, but not uncalled for. How it succeeded will appear in due course. Elizabeth also was not idle, for, having come to terms with the turbulent Shane O'Neill in the north, she considered that an appointment of her own archbishop to Armagh would be an easy matter. Accordingly, after much misgiving as to the qualifications of Adam Loftus, she appointed him to the see. But however slack Shane may have been in other matters this was too much for him; Loftus never set foot in Armagh. Elizabeth's appointments to Meath and

Kildare, though her bishops were able to occupy their sees, as they stood within the Pale, were a dismal failure Craik of Kildare excused his incompetence because of his ignorance of Irish, and of want of preachers, and elected to reside in St Patrick's deanery in Dublin rather than in his diocese No wonder then that he petitioned on several occasions to be relieved of his bishopric Indeed, this was the common pleading of Elizabeth's bishops They saw that their office was useless, that they could not carry out the 'reform' Curwen, Loftus, Craik, and others were continually annoying Cecil, Elizabeth's capable Secretary, to remove them to safe and easy English bishoprics The 'reformers' in Ireland were anything but a happy family, for, as Lord-Deputy Sussex reported, 'Our religion is so abused, as the papists rejoice, the neuter [neutrals] do not mislike changes, and the few zealous professors lament the lack of piety The people without discipline, utterly void of religion, come to divine service as to a May game'

It is necessary to explain this last reference The male heads of Catholic families in Dublin, forced to attend Protestant service in order to avoid the enormous fines for non-attendance, went to the churches, but such was their contempt for the service that they behaved as they would round the may-pole. The people who had attended their early Mass on Sundays considered they were committing no sin in being present in this fashion at the Protestant service. The law-givers themselves made it clear that they required only external appearance, and did not trouble about internal assent. Partly for this reason, and partly because the new service, ordered to be translated into Latin, was largely copied from the Catholic Liturgy, with Mass vestments, even important Catholics for the time being had little scruple in attending this camouflage of the Mass. No doubt, it was an extraordinary state of affairs, but the strings had not yet been drawn tightly on one side or the other Elizabeth's policy during the first half of her reign was one of compromise and procrastination. The peaceful penetration of her power, she considered, would gradually provide a way for the 'reformation' in districts not yet submissive to her

rule, but where her government exercised her authority she would brook no opposition

The chief disturber of the Queen's peace and the chief barrier to the extension of her power was Shane O'Neill. The fencing of these two personalities lasted for several years, each bluffing the other. Even the royal presence failed to placate the sturdy Shane. Elizabeth, ignoring Lord-Deputy Sussex, wished to allure Shane, if possible, to keep his promises. The 'reform' would be a poor thing indeed if she could not have her Primate appointed and settled in Armagh, and all Elizabeth's blandishments on Shane were directed to that object. Desmond of Munster likewise was a strong opponent of her policy whenever he found it advantageous or expedient to adopt that attitude, and he, too, was summoned to the royal presence, but did not succeed in returning to his castle and lands for many years. The O'Byrnes and O'Tooles in Leinster kept Elizabeth's army busy and frustrated her occupation of their territories. With few exceptions the Irish chiefs held their ground, and with them the bishops, with the exception of about seven, also stood firm against the Queen.

It was not until 1563-4 that any notable move was made towards the 'reform'. In 1563 Elizabeth presented no fewer than twenty-four clerics to vicarages, rectories, prebends, and dignities in the dioceses of Dublin, Meath, Cashel, Ossory, Waterford and Lismore, Ferns, Emly and Ardagh. Dublin, Ferns, Kildare, Waterford, Cork, Tuam and Clonfert were held by 'reform' bishops, whilst Meath, Ossory, Cashel and Emly were vacant, the two first by royal deprivation, the third and fourth by death. Elizabeth thus found it possible to promote men, some of them bearing Irish names, to Cathedral and parochial positions in which she expected them to garner the fruit of her 'reform'. Commissioners were sent out through the land to remedy abuses and disorders, but they returned with a doleful tale. 'Here are two good Bishops of Armagh and Meath — the rest of the bishops be all Irish, we need say no more.' On Loftus and Brady alone could they rely for any zeal in the 'reform'. They alone showed any spirit of adventure,

whilst the rest of the 'reform' bishops were intent rather on easy and acceptable livings for themselves, and patronage and lands for their children and relatives, some of these bishops being guilty of gross alienation of see property.

b PAPAL AND ROYAL EPISCOPAL APPOINTMENTS

It is important to realize that the people were supporters of the clergy who entirely rejected the attempted change of religion, for only so can we understand the measures which the Popes took to counter Elizabeth's attempt to destroy Catholicism in Ireland. Nothing shows better the abhorrence of Irish Catholics for the Protestant bishops thrust upon them than a letter of Brady of Meath to Cecil, 14 March 1564, scarcely three months after he had been appointed to the diocese. He writes

O what a sea of troubles have I entered into, storms rising on every side, the ungodly lawyers are not only sworn enemies to the truth ['reform'] but also for lack of due execution of law the out-throwers [disturbers] of the country, the ragged clergy are stubborn and ignorantly blind, so as there is left little hope of their amendment; the simple multitude is through continual ignorance hardly to be won, so as I find *angustiae undique* [troubles everywhere]

Such was the state of the reform 'in the best peopled diocese and the best governed country' in Ireland Curwen's report to Elizabeth was in a similar strain According to Brady, Curwen 'preached now and then,' and according to Loftus, he was an 'unprofitable workman'. According to himself, 'I am insufficient and not liable to accomplish the ministry belonging to the Archbishop here'. He therefore asks to have a suitable bishopric in England.

On the other hand, Sussex endeavoured to effect something at the centre of government Towards the end of 1563 he issued a proclamation against the meetings of friars and popish priests in Dublin and that none should lie within the gates of the City, and ordered a tax to be levied, and had it collected, upon every householder that missed coming to the 'reform' church on Sundays. In order to avoid the tax many Catholics

attended their Mass in the morning and the Protestant church in the afternoon, but to put a stop to that subterfuge a roll of the householders' names was called by the wardens of each parish severally. This was special legislation for the city, where friars and priests were not to be tolerated, but outside Dublin the simple people were not to be molested, as, at the assizes, verdicts could not be obtained against them for non-attendance at Common Prayer. An example, however, made of a Mass-priest might, it was thought, provide a very salutary lesson.

Father Wolf's mission was producing fruit in at least one direction. As it was wellnigh impossible to educate Catholic priests in Ireland, candidates were being recruited in many counties and shipped to foreign ports for continental colleges. One of the foremost of the recruiters was Sir Thady Newman, who was Father Wolf's representative in Dublin. The departure of these youths from the Munster coasts having come to the knowledge of Elizabeth a system of espionage on sea merchants and their ships was adopted and orders were issued to interrogate all mariners as to travellers leaving the ports. This was a new departure in the methods of the 'reform', but it shows that the parochial clergy were sending aspirants to the priesthood to the Continent for education and paying for them out of their slender resources.

So far, the work of administering the Oath of Supremacy had been chiefly confined to the home counties, but in 1564 a commission was issued to chiefs and bishops in the south to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction, with power to correct heresies and to administer the Oath. It is important to observe that though chiefs and bishops might be mentioned in the Commission they did not necessarily carry it out. Their conformity was taken for granted by the officials, wrongly in some cases. But though certain commissioners did travel from town to town, hold assizes, punish or fine offenders, and deliver addresses to the Courts on the duty of good and godly living, the observance of the Queen's laws and due loyalty to her Supremacy and religious service, yet little success attended their efforts except as far as government officials were concerned.

Wherever it was possible to do so, the Pope appointed Catholic bishops to fill vacancies in the sees, on the recommendation of Father Wolf Donat O'Taig having died in 1562, Wolf recommended Richard Creagh for the see of Armagh, who was appointed in 1564 and put under obedience to accept it. Shane O'Neill, however, wanted it for the Dean, Terence Daniel, and wanted the diocese of Down and Connor for his brother, not yet of canonical age, and sent messengers to Rome to secure those positions accordingly. Shane likewise had asked Father Wolf for commendatory letters for his candidates, which the Apostolic Commissary refused, thereby giving offence to Shane. Creagh also gave offence to him at Rome by not furthering his wishes, and was doubtful about a friendly reception from Shane on his arrival in Ireland. It is necessary to mention here that Wrothe, Elizabeth's Commissioner, had previously recommended Daniel for Armagh, but the Queen appointed Loftus. Within an hour after he had landed in Ireland, and having said Mass, probably in Drogheda, Creagh was taken prisoner by the governor and conveyed to the Tower of London (18 January 1565). A long list of questions was submitted to him to which he replied truthfully. Though he was ready to profess loyalty to Elizabeth as Queen of Ireland, and to preach it to his people, yet he refused to take his appointment otherwise than from the Pope. Now, it was quite clear to Elizabeth that her own archbishop was unable to get a foothold in the diocese, yet she preferred to see a Catholic people live in religious and moral disorder rather than allow a Catholic bishop to exercise his zeal for their sanctification. The truth is that she resented the affronts to her ecclesiastical dignity by the sending from Rome of a Papal archbishop in face of her own appointment. Moreover, she considered the capture of Creagh a splendid opportunity of learning all about the ways and means of Catholic action in Ireland and abroad for the continuation of the Church. Lastly, she wanted the temporalities of the see for her own archbishop, without which means of living her appointment to the see was a useless affair, and she would not admit that Loftus had not as good a right, even better, to them than

Creagh had, though they came from a Catholic people for the support of a Catholic pastor

If there was one place that the ecclesiastical commissioners expected would accept the 'reform' it was the Pale, and though little might be expected from the common people but fines for non-attendance at Common Prayer, yet a better example was expected from the nobility and gentry. Even here, Loftus in unmistakable terms confesses the failure of the 'reform'. The vast majority of them, the Nugents, Scurlocks, Nettervilles, Cusacks, Eustaces, &c., had been hearing Mass in their stone mansions that were used as Mass-houses and as lodgings for the Mass-priests. All this was done, not spasmodically, but by arrangement, 'linked in friendship and alliance one with the other', as Loftus puts it. Even as late as 1630, the Protestant archbishop of Dublin, Launcelot Bulkeley, confessed that certain of these houses were recognized as Mass-houses of the districts. But it is worthy of note that Loftus in his report of 1565 refers to the jurors at the sessions of ecclesiastical inquiry as unwilling to give evidence against the gentry, and he also states that he did not force the nobility to reply on oath, but that all came forward boldly and confessed that the majority of them had been attending Mass, since 1560, as before, and had not attended Protestant service. And though Loftus was of a mind to fine them yet they, being 'the gentry and nobility of the English Pale, and the greatest number too, I thought not fit to deal any further with them, until your Majesty's pleasure were therein specially known'. The truth is, the Government had to fall back on these Anglo-Norman Catholic gentlemen to secure law and order within the Pale, and did not wish to antagonize them by forcing them in religious matters.

c. RESULTS OF O'NEILL'S DÉBÂCLE

Sir Henry Sydney having been adopted Lord-Deputy, the first experiment in the subjugation of the country was to be carried out on O'Neill in the north in the autumn of 1566. To add to O'Neill's difficulties, Desmond, who had made a show of rebellion, was induced by Sydney to come to terms and take

a post at Drogheda while he himself proceeded northwards. O'Neill, having ravaged the country, retired to Donegal. Sydney then made his grand tour, nowhere encountering O'Neill's forces, and was met and greeted by northern chiefs and bishops who were only too willing at this time to get rid of the claims and exactions of O'Neill. It is important, however, to get clearly the attitude of the bishops of Derry, Raphoe, and Elphin in attending on Sydney during his tour through their dioceses and in swearing fealty and allegiance to the Queen. In general, three things must be clearly distinguished in the attitude of the Irish bishops during this period, namely, the adoption of Uniformity of worship, the taking of the Oath of Supremacy, and the taking of an oath of allegiance or fealty to the Queen as temporal ruler. It is quite clear that Sydney proposed neither the first nor the second to any of these bishops, but was quite content to receive the third. His object was not to antagonize them but to win them to his side in order to secure the good obedience of their chiefs to the Queen as their overlord, and to bind them in a confederacy against Shane. The bishops were quite content to profess this obedience provided they were allowed freedom of conscience. Sydney was too clever to expose his whole hand, to show what was his ulterior motive in subjugating Shane.

It was not until the following year that Shane was caught in the trap laid for him by the O'Donnells and MacDonnells, and his head was brought to Dublin and stuck on a pole over the Castle gate, where it was seen by the historian Campion four years later. Shane was the ablest of Elizabeth's Irish opponents, though perhaps too much concentrated on his own supremacy in Ulster. However this may have been in his earlier years, there is some evidence available to warrant the conclusion that at least towards the end of his days he had made up his mind that no single Irish chief, whether Celt or Norman, in Ulster or in Munster, was safe as long as there was an English soldier or an English official on Irish soil. Certain it is that he did not receive support from the Irish chiefs at the critical moment, and that, in fact, they held back for personal motives. 'Shane's

vision was larger than theirs, and full credit cannot be done to his memory until more exhaustive inquiry is made and given to the public. Then perhaps we may see in him the Irish Catholic patriot who saw safety for the faith only in the termination of English rule in Ireland, and that he was the first of the Irish chiefs to attempt the double objective.

Sydney had his hands full with the few bishops of the 'reform'. Curwen, unable to further it, was removed to Oxford at his request, and Loftus, unable to accomplish anything in Armagh, was promoted to Dublin. Having settled these matters, Sydney proceeded to Munster on another grand tour. Here, as in Ulster, the greater part of the chiefs came to him craving justice and protection against the powerful over-chief of the south, Desmond. Again, some of the bishops, in full pontificals, came out to meet him and treated him to the Latin *Te Deum* sung in church, and yet Sydney made no complaint of this Catholic display. Shortly after his return the welcome news reached him of the murder of Shane O'Neill. One of the first results of the capture of Shane was the submission of Maguire, the chief of Fermanagh, and of the celebrated Meiler Magrath, the Catholic bishop of Down. When Magrath returned to his diocese it seems that he was not well received by his people on account of his having taken the Oath of Allegiance. He begged Rome to remove him to Clogher where Maguire ruled. Rome did not favour this move, and Magrath remained for some time in Down, but ultimately crossed to London and begged the Privy Council to appoint him to a safe bishopric. Elizabeth sent him to Clogher.

The other result of O'Neill's débâcle was the capture of Archbishop Creagh. He had escaped from the Tower of London and returned to his diocese. On Sydney's forced march northward, Creagh retired to Connacht, where he was taken prisoner and sent to Dublin Castle. He had as companion prisoner Father Wolf, to whom belongs the credit of having initiated the counter-reform to put new life into the decaying members with which the Catholic Church in Ireland had been troubled during the previous thirty years. For the next five years (from 1567) he lay in a filthy cell from which he ultimately escaped. Creagh, on the

other hand, from his 'most obscure cell in which neither light nor sun ever entered', was transferred to the Tower of London, where he was to die a broken man some nineteen years later. The only crime found against him, after many cross-examinations, was that he had taken his diocese from the Pope, and presumed to minister unto his people at a time when Elizabeth's own bishop could not minister there. It was of no avail that Creagh had professed the most loyal obedience to the Queen and endeavoured to induce Shane to remain loyal also. It mattered not that other northern bishops, appointed by the Pope, had been allowed by Sydney to hold their bishoprics after they had professed allegiance, Elizabeth would have no other archbishop in Armagh but her own. The rebuff to her ecclesiastical authority was unpardonable and she did not hesitate to sacrifice one of the finest types of prelate because it suited her whim.

Her 'reform' was a puerile thing, in great measure because of her parsimony. So that her Chancellor, Dr Weston, a layman, might have a sufficient income, she bestowed on him the deanery of St. Patrick's, valued at about £3,600 (*1914 value*). Nor was Weston the only layman who held rich benefices, it was a common practice at this time to bestow rich prebends on Protestant candidates for the ministry to enable them to study for years at Oxford and Cambridge, and pluralities even were not uncommon. And yet there was constant complaint of lack of preachers of the 'reform'. There was a difficulty also in finding a suitable archbishop for Armagh, no fewer than three candidates being proposed by Elizabeth, i.e. Sydney, Brady, and Loftus, the last-named proposing a Calvinist like himself. Loftus, having been reported for his Calvinistic practices in Dublin, especially in moving the Communion Table to the centre of the Church, admitted that in six months he had only held one Communion Service, namely, at Easter. Elizabeth, however, sent a reminder to Sydney that 'we cannot allow that any parsons of any sort should by their doctrine, example, or other innovation make any diversity therein'. She was certainly favourable to ritual, and did not approve of Calvinism.

d. THE STATE CHURCH A FAILURE

Whilst complaints were being constantly sent to Cecil of the incompetence of the 'reform' bishops and of their failure, these bishops were not quite satisfied as to the particular brand of Protestantism that they were expected to promote. Cecil had complained to the Queen of the indecent manner in which the Protestant services were carried out in London, and the Queen being angry, Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, drew up his book of Instructions in 1566 for the due order in the public administration of the Holy Sacrament and in the apparel of all persons ecclesiastical. In spite of the backstairs influence of the earl of Leicester in favour of the Puritans, Parker and the bishops had their way, and thirty-seven London clergy were deprived of their benefices for their disobedience to the Instructions. The result of all this confusion was a great increase in the Puritan party, even among the professors at Oxford who became its leaders and refused to wear the square cap. All this had its repercussion in Ireland, and Loftus and Craik unburdened their consciences to Cecil on the privation of the Puritan Calvinists of their livings, Loftus characterizing the cope and the surplice, then the authorized dress of the clergy of the Established Church, as Popish apparel. He likewise objected to the Communion Table being regarded as an altar, and wished it to be placed in the centre of the church, which was a known Puritan device.

So far, Elizabeth's Irish policy had been of an indefinite and haphazard nature, avoiding energetic measures that would cost money and were, therefore, abhorrent to her parsimonious soul. Her advisers had represented to her that she must make up her mind to lose Ireland or meet force by force, no matter what the cost. Sir Henry Sydney, partaking of the nature of the period in which he lived, was a strange mixture of contradictory qualities. Though appointed to promote Protestantism, he was contemptuous of the Protestant ecclesiastics he met in Ireland. Ready to discuss theology with Catholic bishops, he would have been satisfied to leave them unmolested in their sees, and avail

himself of their assistance, if they would only recognize the Queen's Supremacy. His first report to the Privy Council in 1566 was a clear confession of failure of the 'reform' even in the dioceses of Dublin, Armagh, and Meath, where at least some success might have been expected. The chief results were the decay of churches and chancels, 'universally in ruin and some wholly down', and the miserable wage to vicars or curates, some of whom had three or four cures to make up a decent living. The Queen had most of the benefices in her hands and leased them out to 'farm', sweeping the money into the royal treasury, neither she nor the 'farmers' of the tithes going to the least expense to keep the churches in repair. The few Protestant worshippers and the few Protestant ministers were totally inadequate for the number of those churches taken by force from the Catholics. The State Church was, therefore, entirely wanting in the essential and principal part of a Church, namely, people to be ministered to, but it made what it considered a magnificent stroke in fastening on to the cathedrals as the symbols of the 'reform' in Ireland. The work of destruction, as we have said, was, however, chiefly confined to the churches within the Pale. Outside that area the people had been but little affected by the 'reform', carrying on in the old way, using their churches for Catholic services. In cities and towns such as Waterford and Youghal where a garrison was temporarily stationed, the Mass-priest might be driven out for a time, but seldom hesitated to return the moment the soldiers had taken their departure for other fields of activity. With the advent of the new and energetic Lord-Deputy Sydney, with his clearly defined programme for the diffusion of English rule throughout the land, for the curtailment of the power of the great chiefs and nobles, and for the introduction of English planters, the people were inspired with a new motive for opposition to the 'reform', namely, that of self-preservation.

CHAPTER IV

THE IDENTIFICATION OF NATIONAL AND RELIGIOUS RESISTANCE

a. FAITH AND FATHERLAND

HITHERTO the defence of the Catholic Faith had not been identified with a union of Irishmen against English rule. But the events of the next few years and chiefly the acts of the English government forced all men to see that the preservation of Irish civilization was bound up with resistance to the Protestantizing work of Elizabeth and her officials. The continued incarceration of Archbishop Creagh and Father Wolf, S J., was the cause of much anxiety to Pope Pius V, who wrote to the nuncio at Madrid to do all he could with the Spanish ambassador in London in their behalf. But more unpleasant news was to reach him, that little was to be hoped in that direction from Elizabeth, who had also issued an edict against MacGibbon, the Papal archbishop of Cashel, now (1568) in Spain and on his way to his see. For six years there had been neither Papal nor royal appointment to that see, probably because neither candidate would be considered safe there. MacGibbon was scarcely four months in his diocese when he had Elizabeth's archbishop, MacCaghwell, carried off and shipped to Spain. The explanation of this daring act has never come to light, but it is not improbable that MacCaghwell was glad to quit the country and practise his old faith quietly in Spain. Be this as it may, there is not a single reference to him after he left Ireland.

Events were now beginning to march more quickly, and it was considered that the Parliament of 1569 would hasten secular and religious reform by the abolition of the Irish captainries, the appointment of provincial presidents, the division of the country into shires under sheriffs, and the colonization of south-west Ireland with Protestant English settlers. All this was clearly a declaration of war not only against the Catholic

faith but against the Irish chiefs and the old Irish system of lordship.

To them [says Froude in his *History of England*] the struggle was for their lands and lives, and as the colonization scheme leaked out, it became easy, with such a cause, to unite all Ireland against the invaders. The religious cry and the land cry fell in together. The land was the rallying cry among themselves, religion gave them a claim on the sympathy and the assistance of the Catholic powers. It cannot be said that England deserved to keep a country which it mismanaged so disastrously. The Irish were not to be blamed if they looked to the Pope, to Spain, to France, to any friend in earth or heaven, to deliver them from a Power which discharged no single duty that rulers owe to subjects.

The Munster clans caught fire, out of which arose the 'Desmond Combination' in which the Protestant Butlers of Ormonde also joined, as they, too, were affected by the blow dealt by Sydney against the Irish captainries. This system was the result of the age-old right of every great Irish lord or chief to maintain a fighting force, for his defence against unruly neighbours, which was recruited from his relatives and retainers, from hired troops, and from the members of the tributary families. To support this force the chiefs had recourse to 'coyne and livery' or quartering during certain periods on the members of the chief's territory. Defective and liable to abuse though this system was, the English government in Ireland was quite alive to the fact that it placed in the hands of the Irish chiefs a formidable weapon against their schemes of colonization and reformation all over the land. They were, therefore, determined to remove the one great obstacle that stood in the way of complete conquest.

It was clear that if the old Irish system was to be saved, if the Catholic Church was to be preserved in Ireland, the whole country must combine, and thus combined must appeal to Rome and Spain for help in the inevitable struggle. There arose now as the leader of this confederacy one of the greatest of Irish patriots and one of the most pure-souled and Catholic champions of the Church in Ireland in any age, James Fitzmaurice, the head of the house of Desmond and its territory,

since the earl and his brother were at the time imprisoned in London. To secure the necessary help from Rome and Spain he dispatched abroad MacGibbon, archbishop of Cashel, who brought with him to Spain an important document signed by twelve archbishops and bishops, six earls, and nineteen heads of ruling families. With the aid of his faithful Franciscan friars, he preached a crusade in the Desmond country in Munster and called on the clergy and citizens of the diocese of Cork to 'abolish out of that city that old heresy newly raised and invented' and to 'send away all Protestants by the next wind', that is, the English Protestant planters. 'The Queen', he said, 'is not satisfied with our worldly goods, bellies, and lves, but must also counsel us to forsake the Catholic faith by God unto His Church given, and by the See of Rome hitherto prescribed to all Christian men. If you follow not this Catholic and wholesome exhortation, I will not nor may not be your friend.' Notwithstanding all this, and all the professions of loyalty of the Munster chiefs to the Confederacy, they all fell away from it under pressure, more concerned as they were with their material well-being. James Fitzmaurice stood alone.'

To sum up the state of affairs in 1569 Lord Chancellor Weston declared that the Irish were a 'blind people led by blind guides', that is, that the Catholic people preferred to be led by their bishops and clergy, Parliament declared that it all arose from the want of public or private schools, 'the lack of good bringing up of the youth of this realm', and the lack of English education. To remedy this the Protestant clergy and bishops were called upon by Parliament to contribute towards the upkeep of those schools. Their answer was to throw out the Bill. They had no money for such purposes, much as they liked the 'reform'. On the other hand, the Irish chiefs having been deprived of their power and property, the Catholic churches were unsupported by tithes, and the priests dared not conduct religious services in public wherever English pikes appeared. The revenues of the derelict sees provided funds for Sydney, for the grand falconer, the clerk of the royal kitchen, and others with 'cure of Irish souls'! All the while, the fretful form of Eire

stood on the southern shore peering into the mists and gazing across the waters watching for the foreign galleys to bring 'Spanish Ale' or 'wine from the Royal Pope'.

b IRISH AGENTS ON THE CONTINENT

The first set-back to MacGibbon's mission to Rome and Spain came from the Pope himself, who was amazed that the archbishop had promised, on behalf of the Irish, obedience to the Spanish King. It must be remembered, said Pius V, that the kingdom of Ireland belongs to the ecclesiastical dominion under the title of the fief, and so cannot be granted to any other sovereign except by the Pope who safeguards it, as is his duty, as a right of the Church. MacGibbon immediately explained that the Irish bishops and chiefs did not mean to deprive the Church of its rights in the matter, but rather that they might be released from the tyranny and cruel yoke of the English. The archbishop's vision and advice were sound. He saw clearly the danger to faith and fatherland by delay in sending aid. Had his advice been acted upon at the time, the history of the next ten years, and probably of succeeding generations, might have been quite different. It was a turning-point in the history of Europe.

The Papal rebuff to the archbishop was in reality meant for Philip II of Spain who had been temporizing with Elizabeth, and holding back his help to the persecuted English Catholics. By his Bull of Excommunication of Elizabeth, Pius showed that he regarded this matter very seriously. It does not enter into our province to discuss the Bull, particularly as it now appears that it did not refer to Ireland, since Pius had not conferred the kingdom of Ireland on Elizabeth, and consequently the Irish were by that fact released from allegiance to the Queen of England. It was the Pope's right, therefore, to confer Ireland on whom he pleased. That was the Papal policy at that time.

Some six years before this time there entered on the Irish stage one of those hectic characters who set events marching at a great pace for awhile, but who, after a sequence of success and failure, ended his life tragically. Thomas Stucley, a bold

buccaneer from Levon, had attracted Elizabeth's notice by his piracy and his colonization plans for Florida, and became well known on the Irish coasts to the inhabitants, who marvelled at his deeds. He ingratiated himself into good favour with Shane O'Neill and Sydney, and became Constable of Wexford. Much to the disgust of Elizabeth he took the side of the Irish in political affairs, but finding the pace getting too hot he took ship to Spain, and strutted before the Spanish Court as an Irish nobleman. MacGibbon now thought he could make use of Stucley to bring the necessary help from Spain to Ireland, and proposed to the King to fit out the expedition, with men, money, and munitions. Philip could arrange this secretly without breaking with Elizabeth, just as Elizabeth herself was sending aid secretly to the Protestants in Spanish Flanders.

But another rift in the late disturbed MacGibbon's Spanish mission. He had found out meanwhile many discreditable things about Stucley and made them known to the King. Stucley, on the other hand, did not spare the archbishop, who wished now to see what help France was ready to lend to the Irish cause. France and Spain were watching each other like cat and dog in regard to their intentions towards England. Accordingly, MacGibbon set out for France, where the earl of Thomond, sent by Fitzmaurice, had already arrived for the purpose of interesting the Queen Mother in the Irish cause. The result was that some kind of a relief expedition was being prepared on the Breton coast about which Walsingham, the English ambassador at Paris, was informed by his numerous spies. MacGibbon and Walsingham now crossed swords in diplomacy, the archbishop pleading to be allowed to return to his diocese and professing loyalty to Elizabeth. It was clear to him that little help was to be expected either from Spain or France and he wished to return home to acquaint Fitzmaurice of the situation.

Stucley, however, had succeeded in extracting promises of help from Spain, he himself to be the grand commander of the expedition. Unfortunately for himself, he had found that he was under excommunication for having seized monastic possessions in

Ireland, and he wished to repair to Rome to throw himself at the Pontiff's feet before he could undertake the command. Shortly after he arrived in Rome, Stucley joined Don John's expedition against the Turks, distinguished himself at the battle of Lepanto, and returned to Rome with all the honours of war. He had as little trouble in gaining the good graces of the Papal Court as he had in Madrid and London, and especially gained the confidence of the English exiles in Rome, posing as the most implacable enemy of Elizabeth. Pius V now despatched Stucley to Philip with warm recommendation, assuring the King that if he did not wish to embark on the Irish expedition under his own name, he might have it placed under the banner of the Holy See. But Philip was paying little attention to that subject as he had wished to stake all his success on the utilizing of his troops in Flanders for a descent on England provided the movement was supported by a rising of English Catholics and by a simultaneous insurrection in Ireland. Ireland was to be a mere pawn in the game.

Affairs in Ireland now demand attention. The elusive Meiler Magrath was promoted by Elizabeth from Clogher to Cashel in 1571. As English colonization was being carried out in Tipperary, Magrath considered it a safe see, he had strong objections to ministering, or rather to episcopating, among the rebel Irish unless he felt sure he was in no danger. A good show of strength was being made by the presidents of Munster and Connacht, Perrot and Fitton, and Fitzmaurice was being hard pressed to keep his small forces together. Magrath, considering it safe to show his hand, imprisoned some Franciscan friars who were preaching in the locality and whom he suspected of having news of the episcopal emissaries abroad. But Fitzmaurice, evading Perrot, appeared in Cashel and threatened the direst penalties on Magrath if he did not release the friars. Magrath, not feeling Cashel the safe place he had thought, petitioned to be removed to Down.

Elizabeth had further trouble with her bishops. Openly accused of adultery, Bishop Dixon of Cork was called to Dublin, made to confess his crime, and dismissed. Her prebendaries in

St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, were a source of scandal to Loftus. Although attending in their stalls during Protestant service, they were, in great majority, simply qualifying for their revenues, and holding their Catholic services elsewhere. Undoubtedly it was an anomalous position, one that could not be condoned, but compromise in religion on both sides was not infrequent. The result of all the colonization and presidential campaigns, in Munster, Connacht, and Ulster was that the Catholic Church was knocked out of gear to a very large extent, instruction in religion and preaching being little resorted to in public. The Sacraments being rarely administered in public, morals suffered in consequence, and the faithful Catholic people had to rely on chance visits from their clergy and from a few roving Franciscans.

A most perfect system of espionage was set in motion by Elizabeth in the southern ports of Ireland to obtain information from mariners and travellers to France and Spain as to the preparations made there for expeditions to Ireland and who were concerned in them. Although not always strictly accurate, yet the reports are strikingly near the truth, and were made up of stories from English spies and from tavern gossip of sailors. They were sufficiently alarming to put Elizabeth on her guard and to counter the movements by her diplomacy. The man most closely watched was MacGibbon, archbishop of Cashel, who had made his way to Ireland to inform Fitzmaurice of the negotiations abroad. On his way back to Flanders with some companions, and with a bundle of papers, he was taken prisoner in Scotland by the Regent Marr, who refused to surrender him to Elizabeth as the bribe was too insignificant. Eventually the archbishop succeeded in escaping and made his way to Rome.

Several sees were now vacant by death, and Elizabeth had the greatest difficulty in obtaining suitable candidates. Bishops of sees remote from Dublin were useless unless they could preach in the Irish language, and the number of those who were so capable was small indeed. She had likewise difficulty in inducing the Irish chiefs to help her to govern Ireland, without which help, the Lord-Deputy declared, the task was impossible. The

plantation of Ulster ended in disaster through the opposition of the northern chiefs, led by Sir Felim O'Neill. Fitton's presidency of Connacht likewise ended in disaster through the open rebellion of the earl of Clanricard's two sons, Ulick and John Burke. Perrot, in Munster, alone could boast that he had accomplished something. He had by threats and force called off the weaklings from the side of Fitzmaurice, who, joined by the Burkes, but too late by the Scots, found himself hemmed in in the Glen of Aherlow in co. Tipperary, where he was forced to sign an ignominious document of submission drawn up by the President. Perrot concludes his account of this event (1573) with the comforting information to Elizabeth: 'forty-five notable malefactors were put to death at the sessions at Limerick, some for treasons, some for murders and felonies'. He adds that he is going to Cashel, Clonmel, and Cork 'for the like redress'.

A new Pope was now seated on the Papal throne in the person of Gregory XIII, who not only listened with sympathy to the representations of the Irish emissaries but heartily agreed that 'the salvation of Christendom depended on the stout assailing of England'. They had pointed out to the Spanish King and to the Pope that the interests of Christendom could be promoted in the British Isles only in one way, namely, by the establishment of a Catholic State with a Catholic Sovereign in Ireland. With remarkable energy Gregory tried to interest Philip II in the Irish cause, which, in season and out of season, he exhibited as the cause of God and of His Church. Fitzmaurice, however, saw that, in view of the treaty between England and Spain, it was hopeless to expect Philip to come out openly in favour of Ireland, and advised his negotiators to confine themselves to securing some secret help in the way of arms, money, and munitions.

Before Philip would make any move in this direction he required to be informed in detail as to the resources and the condition of Ireland. Father Wolf, S.J., had arrived in Madrid after his escape from Dublin Castle and wrote a most important and highly informative description of Ireland which he handed to the King. In another report to the Vatican, whilst not com-

plimentary to the majority of the Irish bishops, whom he calls 'hirelings and dumb dogs' because they had professed allegiance to Elizabeth, yet he praises highly Archbishop Creagh o Armagh, who had also professed allegiance, and gives an intimate picture, as his fellow prisoner, of his sufferings. But he was principally concerned, in his report to Philip, in describing the cities, chief towns, and ports, with the strength of their fortifications. This was what Philip was chiefly interested in. Shortly afterwards he sent his own envoy to Ireland to test the accuracy of Father Wolf's report. The latter was so tired of Philip's indecisions that he decided to go to Rome. Fitzmaurice, also worn out with anxious waiting, slipped quietly out of Ireland and landed at St Malo in Brittany.

Between the courts of Paris and St Malo, Fitzmaurice spent much time in his efforts to gather together the help requisite to withstand the encroachments of Elizabeth's forces. The object of all his endeavours, he stated, was 'the glory of God and the salvation of souls redeemed by the Blood of Christ'. But he made little or no progress on account of political complications. In Rome, however, more activity in the cause was apparent. There were two projects before the Pope, Irish and English. The Irish project, put forward by Fitzmaurice's agents, Father Wolf, Father Hely, and Bishop MacBrien, consisted in an appeal for money, arms, and munitions, and a few thousand experienced officers and tried soldiers to train Irish troops, and a Papal commission for a leader, preferably James Fitzmaurice. The Irish Crown would descend on whomsoever the Pope and the King of Spain should select. On the other hand, influential British residents in Rome, Dr. Sander, Dr. Allen, Sir Francis Englefield, Dr. Lewis, and Dr. Clenoge, warmly supported by Stucley, asked the Pope for 1,500 troops, with means of transport and supplies for six months, the negotiators raising another 1,500 in Italy or Sicily. The object of this expedition was to land at some suitable English port, call English Catholics to arms, and place Mary Queen of Scots on the throne. The leader selected was Stucley. The relations between these two parties of negotiators were friendly enough, but the

divergent motives were bound to lead to misunderstanding. The years, however, went by, constant correspondence being kept up between Rome and Spain, and yet nothing practical took shape because of Philip's habitual hesitation.

In Ireland, Sydney was busy touring the country, receiving the allegiance of the bishops and the chiefs, settling internal disorders, and lamenting the miserable state of religion, 'the temples ruined, and the parish churches almost without [Protestant] Curates or pastors for to read service or to preach the Gospel to the people'. There was, he said, no 'suitable provision for those who might offer their services, or be called over from England or Scotland to help on the work' Between Elizabeth and the 'farmers' of the tithes there was little money available to pay the miserable stipend of the Protestant curates. Yet all bishops, priests, and friars coming to Ireland from abroad were diligently searched and cast into prison One of the most important who returned about this time was Edmund Tanner, a native of Dublin. Having been an exemplary member of the Jesuit Society, he asked for permission to return to Ireland in any capacity provided he could spend the remainder of his days preaching and ministering to the Irish people who, he said, were in a depraved condition, though not infected with heresy. There was little instruction in the Christian faith, sermons were uncommon, and the sacraments rarely administered. This state of affairs was mainly true of country districts and towns occupied by English forces.

Having been consecrated in Rome, Tanner repaired to Ireland, and having landed at Galway and advanced into Munster, was immediately taken prisoner with his chaplain. Escaping from prison, he journeyed through the country reconciling to the Church those who had compromised, and administering the Sacraments. In spite of ill health he persevered in his dangerous mission for nearly two years when, worn out, he died on 4 June 1579 There were other members of the Jesuit Order in Munster, teaching school and spreading everywhere the good odour of their Society. Many priests had returned from Louvain and were openly carrying out their duties in the south of Ireland.

As to the state of religion at this time, there is more definite information about the city of Waterford than about any other city or town.

The proud and undutiful inhabitants of this town [wrote Sir William Drury, President of Munster, to the Secretary of State in 1577] are so cankered in Popery, undutiful to her Majesty, and hath their altars, painted images and candlesticks, in derision of the Gospel, every day in their Synagogues, so detestable that they may be called the unruly neuters rather than subjects Masses infinite they have in their several churches every morning, without any fear I have spied them, for I chanced to arrive last Sunday at 5 in the clock in the morning, and saw them resort out of the churches by heaps

The same might be said of many another town where British pikes were not in evidence.

When Catholics began to grow too bold in religious practices, Elizabeth and her Council usually resorted to that panacea for all religious ills, an ecclesiastical commission. An important one was issued at this time 'to correct all heresies, schisms' and 'to search out and correct all persons who obstinately absent themselves from divine service as by law appointed'. Few people, however, took these commissions seriously, except 'temporal officers having the Queen's wages'. Even in Meath, where some success was expected from the 'reform', friars and priests, according to Bishop Brady, were openly carrying on their religion and moving about with impunity, apparently with Armagh as their objective. It is probable that a synod of some kind was held at this time in the north to discuss the news from Rome, for great things were expected from Fitzmaurice's visit thither.

c. THE FITZMAURICE EXPEDITION

Fitzmaurice was in Rome early in 1577 and obtained the Papal authorization he had been long seeking Gregory's Brief set forth:

Now, the said James, impelled by zeal for the glory of God's house, by the desire of seeing our holy religion restored in his country, by love of his native land, and by his own innate virtue and magnanimity

of soul, is determined with God's help to shake that hard and intolerable yoke from off your necks, and hopes to find many to co-operate with him in carrying out his intention and design

Fitzmaurice's character and purpose could not be better summed up in so few words. He set out from Rome furnished with Papal letters to the nuncio in Portugal directing him to assist the Irish chief in securing a ship with firearms and weapons for his journey to Ireland. He was comforted also by the Papal promise that, if he rallied the country round the Catholic standard in the name of the Pope, he might expect further help from Rome or Spain or both. Fitzmaurice's expedition, said the Pope, 'would give us breathing time to wait for the English enterprise to mature and would prevent the Queen from harassing others'.

Accompanied by Bishop O'Hely of Mayo and some eighty soldiers from Spain and Portugal, Fitzmaurice sailed out of the harbour of Lisbon, 19 November 1577, with a ship carrying 200 calivers and 22 pieces of ordnance, a quantity of gunpowder, and other munitions of war. Misfortune dogged his steps at the various attempts he made to repair to Ireland. What with shipwreck, piracy, mutiny, and penury, this long-expected and ardently desired expedition was delayed for two years. The heart of Fitzmaurice must have been a stout one to bear up in face of such disasters.

The Pope, believing that Fitzmaurice was safely on his way to his country, got busy in endeavouring to induce Philip II to pursue the old plan of sending an expeditionary force from Flanders to England. But as Philip was sufficiently occupied in preserving Flanders for himself, the expeditionary force was out of the question. The Pope accordingly concluded that if anything was to be done for England and Ireland it must be done by himself. On the 3rd January 1578 the Papal Secretary was able to report to the nuncio in Spain that 'His Holiness has definitely decided to provide Stucley with a good ship', and hoped that the King had done similarly with Fitzmaurice, 'so that these two, acting in concert, may do all the harm they can to that wicked woman'. Compared with Fitzmaurice's

miserable ship, Stucley's was princely. The latter had 'a ship of the largest size . . . and 600 picked soldiers . . . with plentiful supplies of all things needed for six months—victuals in good abundance, money to meet all expenses, and arquebuses, pikes, and other arms for 3,000 men—all of which will cost His Holiness thousands and thousands of crowns'.

So keen was the Pope on the expedition that he visited the ship at Civitavecchia, accompanied by three cardinals. After many vicissitudes the good *St John* arrived at Lisbon. Misfortune lay in wait also for this expedition. Sebastian, King of Portugal, was at this time raising an imposing army for the purpose of crushing the Moors in Africa, and by some sinister promises induced Stucley and his men to join in this enterprise that he regarded as a kind of crusade. Although Stucley seems to have had the approval of the Apostolic Collector in Lisbon, yet the true explanation of his defection or treachery will never be known. At all events it spurred on Fitzmaurice, and his two great friends, Mgr Sega, Apostolic Nuncio in Madrid, and Dr. Sander, the English exile, to go ahead with their own miserable force that they had succeeded in getting together for this last voyage. 'I care for no soldiers at all; you and I are enough', Fitzmaurice said to Dr. Sander, 'therefore, let us go, for I know the minds of the noblemen of Ireland.' In this he was wrong, as he was to know to his cost.

The ill-fated, tiny force landed near Dingle on the 14th July 1579. In all it did not exceed some seventy souls, which included Fitzmaurice, Sander, Bishop O'Gallagher of Killala, Bishop O'Hely of Mayo, four Irish priests, four Franciscans, and fifty Spanish and Italian soldiers. 'Their strength', wrote the nuncio of Spain afterwards, 'lay in Fitzmaurice's name, which was itself a firebrand, in their being representatives of the Pope, and in the precious banner blessed by His Holiness's hands, on which was emblazoned a Christ upon the Cross.' Though bonfires blazed on the hills around Dingle, and Fitzmaurice called on the chiefs in the Pope's name, yet the majority of them preferred to know Fitzmaurice's strength before deciding to join him. The result was that Fitzmaurice, in endeavouring to cut

a way through to join the Burkes of Clanricard and to rouse his old supporters in Tipperary, fell at the hands of his kinsfolk, the Burkes of Castleconnell, who were employed by the Government forces for that purpose. In the following year, at Smerwick harbour, took place the shameless massacre, by Lord Gray, of the garrison of '600 men', chiefly Italians and Spaniards, who had meanwhile come from Spain

One incident that shows the temper of Elizabeth's officials at this time was the execution of Bishop O'Hely, who had accompanied Fitzmaurice. Taken prisoner, and tried by court-martial under President Drury, he was promised life and the peaceful possession of his see, with honours and emoluments, if only he would renounce his faith and confess the real purpose for which he had come. As for the faith, the bishop replied that no earthly consideration would induce him to renounce it; whilst as regards the second, he replied that he had come as a bishop to promote the cause of religion and the salvation of souls. More than this O'Hely would not say, though sharp spikes were driven with a hammer through his fingers, severing them from his hand. Accompanied by Con, or Conor, O'Rourke, of the princely family of the O'Rourkes, O'Hely and his companion were hanged by the neck until they were dead. Thus ended this period of the 'reform', so seasoned with high hopes on the part of Catholics, so dogged by misfortune, and so fraught with dire consequences during the remaining years of Elizabeth's reign

d MARTYRS FOR THE FAITH

Although in the first twenty-two years of Elizabeth's reign her government, not wishing to antagonize the Catholic gentry of the Pale, had abstained from violent measures to promote the 'reform', yet after 1580 the persecution was carried on with great bitterness. Many of the clergy, both secular and regular, were put to death, the Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans being special objects of governmental hatred. By martial law, mock trial, and no trial they were condemned. The events of the previous ten years in Rome and Spain had provided Eliza-

beth with an excuse to regard priests who were busy ministering to the people, and newly ordained priests coming from continental colleges, as in league with a foreign power for the destruction of her own. No doubt there were cases in which it is difficult to separate the political from the religious element, but in the main it was sufficient that they were priests in order that they might be condemned. And if these priests were engaged in aiding a foreign power in Ireland they had the sanction of the Pope, who did not regard Elizabeth as the rightful ruler in Ireland and who had absolved even English Catholics from their allegiance to her. Besides, the Pope having agreed that the safety of the Catholic Church in Ireland depended on the depriving of Elizabeth of her power, the struggle in Ireland took the form of a crusade. In these circumstances it is difficult to see how those priests and laymen who suffered the death penalty for being implicated in it may not be regarded as martyrs for the Faith.

The first Irish victim of whose martyrdom it is possible to produce direct contemporary evidence was Edmond Daniel, a Jesuit scholastic, who was hanged, drawn, and quartered at Cork (25 February 1572) on the ground that he was guilty of high treason in refusing to recognize the Queen's supremacy in matters of religion, in upholding that of the Pope, and in carrying letters from the Holy See to James Fitzmaurice. Several bishops were thrown into prison, such as O'Herlihy of Ross, MacGibbon of Cashel, Power of Ferns, Tanner of Cork, &c., but fortunately they escaped. Others died in prison, such as Skerrett of Tuam and O'Brien of Emly. Some, as McGauran of Armagh and O'Gallagher of Derry, died at the hands of soldiers. Bishop O'Hely, as has been said, was hanged at Kilmallock. The most distinguished of these martyrs was undoubtedly Dermot O'Hurley, archbishop of Cashel (1581), who having denied that he had returned to Ireland to stir up strife, was subjected nevertheless to horrible torture. Having had his feet and legs encased in jack boots, filled with oil and grease, which were held over a fire, and still refusing to acknowledge the Queen's supremacy, he was condemned by court-martial and hanged in Dublin in 1584.

Laymen also who took up arms to defend their faith and their country suffered the extreme penalty. The rising led by Viscount Baltinglas ended disastrously in 1580, and forty-five of those who were accused of complicity in it were executed. These included Gaels and Anglo-Normans, many of them being the principal gentry of the Pale. Although Elizabeth had sent an instruction to Dublin Castle authorities 'not to proceed to that severity which by a course of justice might deservedly be inflicted on the accused, but to extend grace and mercy to the generality of the offenders', yet the authorities deliberately kept back the instruction until the death penalty had been inflicted. The broad acres belonging to the accused were too valuable to these officials that they should let them slip out of their hands. They cared little about Elizabeth's reason for showing mercy to these gentlemen of the Pale, namely, that she depended on them, staunch Catholics though they were, to preserve law and order in the country. The truth is, Elizabeth's representatives in Ireland had not the power to enforce her wishes in regard to religion, and Elizabeth herself had no wish to stir up a general insurrection by attempting to punish the lay nobles for their flagrant disregard of her ordinances. Hence her care was to allow a certain measure of toleration to the noblemen, and to explain away the punishments inflicted on the clergy as having been imposed not on account of religion, but on account of their traitorous designs.

Like her father, Elizabeth looked with avaricious eyes on monastic possessions. Many that had escaped the vigilance of Henry VIII fell into the hands of his daughter, '34 abbeys and religious houses with very good lands belonging to them' and '72 abbeys and priories concealed from her Majesty'. In round numbers they were valued at £4,716 annually (about £84,000, 1914 value). This destruction, however, did not prevent the Franciscans and Dominicans especially from continuing their opposition to the 'reform' and maintaining themselves on the charity of the people. Nor did it prevent priests and laymen, especially the Jesuits, from teaching schools, primary and classical, in private houses and in the hedges. Theological

schools were indeed closed; but, first, the education given to the Irish exiles on the Continent, and, later, the establishment of Irish colleges in Rome, France, Spain, and the Netherlands supplied the wants of the Irish priesthood.

On the other hand, the 'reformers' put their faith in a system of English schools as a means of counteracting the education abroad. But this fell through, as neither Elizabeth, with the revenues from religious houses and ecclesiastical benefices, nor the Protestant bishops were willing to pay for these schools. The conversion of St. Patrick's Cathedral into a university for educating Catholic youth in right living and learning, the want of which had 'brought a general disorder in this land', had been strongly opposed by Archbishops Curwen and Loftus, through selfish motives. The latter's suggestion that the Dublin Corporation should hand over the site of the old religious house of All Hallows in Dublin for the establishment of the university was adopted, and Dublin University was founded, its first college, Trinity, being opened in 1593. Although the majority of the Dublin Corporation were Catholics, and many of the subscribers were Anglo-Irish Catholics, yet the university was intended as a bulwark of Protestantism and of English power in Ireland.

e NO ZEAL FOR THE 'REFORM'

One more attempt was made in Elizabeth's reign by Irish chiefs to wrest the power out of her hands. The foremost among them were Hugh O'Neill and Hugh O'Donnell, princes of Tyrone and Tir-Connail, who, having inflicted defeat on Elizabeth's forces, demanded that 'all persons have free liberty of conscience'. This request was characterized as 'disloyal'.

As most of the Anglo-Irish nobles, though staunch Catholics, preferred toleration from Elizabeth to taking sides with O'Neill for the complete restoration of their religion, the northern princes turned to Rome and Spain for aid to continue the struggle. They desired, besides material assistance, a Papal declaration that they engaged in a holy war. This request was warmly supported at Rome by Peter Lombard, archbishop of

Armagh, and Clement VIII sent a nuncio to Ireland. Philip II of Spain at last consented to dispatch a force into Ireland, but instead of landing in the north, the territory of O'Neill and O'Donnell, it arrived at Kinsale, Co Cork (1601), and, though supported by the forces of the Northern chiefs, it suffered complete defeat. The memory of this disaster survived for many years, tearing the heart out of the Irish Catholics.

In spite of all the measures taken, the 'reform' made little or no progress. 'The evil disposition of the Irish people', lamented the Privy Council, 'in most places of that kingdom, and especially of the inhabitants of Waterford, in matters of religion' was well known. Elizabeth ordered an inquiry into 'this general defection', and as to how it might be reformed. A gloomy report on the matter by Carew showed, however, that 'now not so much as the mayors will show any such external obedience [as they showed formerly], and by that means the queen's sword is a recusant'. The Irish people were, therefore, even more obstinate in their religion towards the end of Elizabeth's reign.

As has been pointed out, the men into whose hands the benefices of the Church had passed took no steps to look after the repair of the churches or to provide clergy to preach the new religion. The few English ministers who came to Ireland were 'of some bad note'. No wonder, then, that Edmund Spenser described the Protestant clergy of Ireland as 'bad, licentious, and most disordered'.

Whatever disorders [he wrote] you see in the Church of England, you may find in Ireland, and many more, namely, gross simony, greedy covetousness, incontinence, careless sloth, and generally all disordered life in the common clergyman . They neither read the scriptures, nor preach to the people, nor administer the communion

It is great wonder [he continues] to see the odds which are between the zeal of the Popish priests and the ministers of the gospel [Protestant clergymen] For they [Catholics] spare not to come out of Spain, from Rome, and from Rheims, by long toil and dangerous travelling hither, where they know peril of death awaiteth them, and no reward or riches are to be found, only to draw the people

unto the church of Rome, whereas some of our idle ministers [Archbishop Magrath of Cashel, a good example], having a way for credit and estimation thereby opened unto them without pains and without peril, will neither for the same, nor any love of God, nor zeal of religion, nor for all the good they may do for winning souls to God, be drawn forth from their warm nests to look out into God's harvest

Comment on this summary of the religious situation in Ireland towards the end of Elizabeth's reign would be superfluous.

CHAPTER V

IRELAND IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND
EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

THE history of Ireland in the seventeenth century is throughout affected by the commonly held belief that the Stuarts were secretly at least favourable to the restoration of the Catholic Religion. With the accession of the son of Mary Queen of Scots to the English throne as James I, Irish hopes ran high only to be dashed to the ground. It was this unfortunate devotion of the people to the Stuart cause that brought about the disastrous dissension in 1641–5 between the native Irish and the Anglo-Irish Catholics. In later years it provided the government with an excuse to doubt the loyalty of Irish Catholics unless they took an oath swearing no allegiance to the Stuart Pretender and in default of this to inflict further penalties on them. James, however, soon showed that the religion of his mother found no sympathetic response in his heart, and that, on the contrary, he meant to pursue the policy of those who sacrificed his mother. On the 4th July 1605 he commanded ‘all Jesuits, seminary priests, or other priests whatsoever, made and ordained by any authority derived or pretended to be derived from the see of Rome’ to depart from the kingdom before the end of December. All priests who refused to obey or who ventured to come into Ireland after that date, and all who received or assisted such persons, were to be arrested and punished according to the laws and statutes of that realm, and all the people were exhorted ‘to come to their several parish churches or chapels, to hear divine service every Sunday and holiday’ under threat of being punished for disobedience. The whole blame of the late war was thrown on the Jesuits and seminary priests, and doubts were cast upon the loyalty of the Catholic gentry of the Pale. Notwithstanding all proclamations, there were in Ireland in 1613 ‘about 800 secular priests, 130 Franciscans, 20 Jesuits, and a few Benedictines and Dominicans’.

Although the persecution under James was violent the

Catholics were well prepared to meet the storm through the encouragement and help of their faithful clergy. The only weak point was the almost complete destruction of the Irish hierarchy. Vicars-general, however, were appointed to look after the sees as best they could. Ulster had only three bishops, Leinster could scarcely boast of one able to do any work, Munster had one active prelate in Dermot MacCragh of Cork, but Connacht was completely bereft of pastors. Bernard Moriarty, vicar-general of Dublin, was arrested and died of wounds in prison, whilst his successor, Robert Lalor, also arrested, was banished. Cornelius O'Devany, bishop of Down, was hanged, drawn, and quartered in Dublin. Yet there were not wanting signs of activity in the direction of organizing the clergy for the ministrations to the people. Archbishop Matthews of Dublin held a provincial synod in Kilkenny (1614) and Dr Rothe, the representative of Peter Lombard, archbishop of Armagh, convoked a similar synod at Drogheda. Although disobedience to the civil rulers in temporal matters was discountenanced, yet there was to be no prevarication or compromise as to attendance at Protestant worship. This latter decree brought matters to a crisis, and laymen were now brought before the consistorial courts for non-attendance and before the Dublin Star Chamber, and heavy fines were inflicted. Catholics were forbidden to teach school, Catholic parents were forbidden to send their children abroad, Catholic minors were compelled to take the Oath of Supremacy before they could get letters of freedom from the Court of Wards (1617), and all mayors and officials were commanded to take the oath under penalty of having their towns disfranchised.

During the opening years of the reign of Charles I, the persecution was much less violent and, as he had promised solemnly not to enforce the laws against Catholics, it was hoped that at last they might expect toleration. But the very mention of toleration filled the Protestant bishops with alarm. Those prelates declared that

The religion of the Papists is superstitious and idolatrous; their faith and doctrine erroneous and heretical, their church in respect

of both apostatical To give them, therefore, a toleration, or to consent that they may freely exercise their religion, and profess their faith and doctrine is a grievous sin, and that in two respects For it is to make ourselves accessory, not only to their superstitions, idolatries, and heresies, and in a word, to all the abominations of Popery, but also, which is a consequent of the former, to the perdition of the seduced people which perish in the deluge of Catholic apostacy To grant them toleration, in respect of any money to be given or contribution to be made by them is to set religion to sale, and, with it, the souls of the people whom Christ Our Saviour hath redeemed with His most precious blood

The Protestant Church in Ireland had thrown off the mask; there was no longer any attempt to confuse the issue by introducing the political element, it was simply a denial of Christian charity, a denial of the right of a Christian Church to exercise its religion, and in such terms as to make a decent Protestant of the present day ashamed to read them. Following this proclamation, the churches that had been opened for Catholic worship in the cities and towns were set upon once more, the altars destroyed, and the priests again thrown into prison. The projected plantation of the country with Protestants was at the root of that intolerant outburst which drove the Irish natives and the Anglo-Irish into the Confederate War of 1641-5, supported by the Papal Legate Rinuccini and the Irish Franciscan, Luke Wadding As we have already stated, the senseless devotion to the Stuart cause on the part of the Anglo-Irish Catholics brought dissension between them and the natives. Indeed, even some of the natives were inspired with the same devotion, and historians and Irish poets handed on the unfortunate Stuart tradition

Both royalists and Irish natives were to suffer the penalty indiscriminately under Cromwell, and the massacres of Drogheda and Wexford, and the trek of landowners of three-fourths of Ireland into Connacht followed. It was not only one of the most cruel pages in Irish history, but a most shamelessly corrupt parcelling out of lands belonging to royalist and native to adventurers and soldiers, who had subscribed or fought against

Charles. Even after the restoration of Charles II, the Cromwellists were in power in Parliament and country, and the Court of Claims, administered by Cromwellists, made it extremely difficult for any Catholic to prove he was 'innocent' before being restored to his lands. They were determined to side-step all Charles's efforts to do justice to Catholics, and to confirm Cromwellian planters on the confiscated lands. In this they were supported by Ormonde, a dangerous enemy of the Catholic Church. His old bitterness against the Irish bishops broke out again, and, by stirring up dissension between royalist and Irish Catholics, he thought to divide the clergy. In this he had a useful instrument in Peter Walsh, a Franciscan friar, one of the few Franciscans faithless to his country. The celebrated Remonstrance (1666), disrespectful to the Pope, broke up the meeting of bishops and clergy in Dublin, organized by Ormonde, and tampered with by Walsh. The oath of loyalty to the King had been framed on the model of an Oath of Allegiance which had been condemned more than once by the Pope.

The result of all this was that the clergy opposed to the Remonstrance were thrown into prison. With the advent of Lord Berkeley as Viceroy, toleration was shown to Catholics, and schools were opened, principally by Jesuits, in several places. Sees were occupied which had been vacant for many years. Oliver Plunkett was appointed to Armagh, Peter Talbot, ex-S J., to Dublin, William Burgat to Cashel, and James Lynch to Tuam. But the infamous and now discredited Titus Oates plot being foisted on a credulous people, Plunkett and Talbot were marked as particularly active offenders. Schools and churches were closed, priests shipped abroad, Talbot was thrown into prison, where he died (1680), and Plunkett, denied trial in Dublin, was unjustly tried, and, through perjured witnesses, condemned, and executed at Tyburn (1681). Many other bishops and vicars-general were thrown into prison or banished, and spies were set on the track of those who had escaped.

On the accession of James II, the Catholics of Ireland had reason to hope for an improvement in their position, and this time at least they were not disappointed, though the respite was

short-lived. The battles of the Boyne, Aughrim, and Limerick were the scenes of the pivotal engagements of a campaign in which the armies of James and William of Orange battled for a kingdom, and the Irish people fought for political and religious liberty. The famous Treaty of Limerick was signed on the 3rd October 1691, and its terms were confirmed by William. The first of its articles was an unconditional guarantee of religious freedom to the Irish people.

Honour was not, however, to be found among the Irish Protestant bishops, who took care to inflame passion and bigotry by declaring that no faith should be kept with 'heretics', and when Parliament met in 1692 it was in no mood to make any concessions. The few Catholic members who presented themselves were called upon to subscribe a Declaration against Transubstantiation drawn up by the English Parliament in 1691. Having in this way excluded all Catholics from Parliament, the Houses refused absolutely to confirm the Treaty of Limerick. The sequel was a century of persecution, a century of penal laws due solely to the desire of the Protestant minority to wreak a terrible vengeance on their Catholic countrymen to drive them out of public life, by excluding them from the learned professions and from all civil and military offices, to deprive them of the means of education at home and abroad, to uproot their religion by banishing the bishops and clergy, and, in a word, to reduce them to the same position as the native population of the English plantations in the West Indies.

That situation remained until the last quarter of the eighteenth century when, thanks to the Catholic Associations, and to men such as Dr Curry, Charles O'Connor, Thomas Wyse, Henry Grattan, John Keogh, Wolfe Tone, and Daniel O'Connell, Relief Bills were passed which removed many Catholic grievances. It was not until 1829 that O'Connell succeeded in wresting Catholic Emancipation from George IV. Though this Act had many serious defects, principally that of new restrictions on religious orders, and though it was honoured more in the breach than in the observance for nearly seventy years, yet it had one great merit, namely, that it excluded all provisions for

English interference in the Catholic Church in Ireland. This was the chief personal triumph of Daniel O'Connell. Considering the royalist leanings of some members of the Catholic hierarchy of that day it was indeed no mean triumph. It was more: it was the necessary first step in any real, even political, advance to nationalist victory and to the removal of the last shackles that bound Catholic Ireland.

LEGISLATION OF THE CHANGE OF RELIGION

(a) IN ENGLAND, (b) IN SCOTLAND, (c) IN IRELAND

CALENDAR OF THE DECREES BY WHICH THE CHANGE OF RELIGION WAS EFFECTED IN ENGLAND

HENRY VIII

(1) 1530. *Act of the Convocation of Canterbury.*

By this Act a grant of money was made to the King in consideration that he remitted the penalties of *Praemunire* recently incurred. Narrating that many enemies were attacking the Church and the Anglican clergy Convocation added the words 'whose singular protector, only and supreme lord, and as far as the law of Christ allows, supreme head we recognize his majesty to be' The Convocation of York made a grant with the same phrase embodied Bishop Tunstall and later the whole of the northern province made a public protest that they intended the phrase only to apply to temporalities and not to spiritualities.

(2) 1533 *Instrument on the Submission of the Clergy made in the King's Presence.*

The legal record of the Act by which the clergy promised never to enact any canons except by royal licence, and to be content to have all existing canons revised by a commission appointed by the King.

(3) 1533. *An Act that appeals in such cases as have been used to be pursued to the See of Rome shall not be from henceforth had nor used but within this Realm* (24 Hen. VIII, c. 12).

The preamble asserts that the realm consists of one supreme head and king, and a body politic of all sorts, divided into the spirituality and the temporality. Further that matters of divine law and spiritual learning are declared, interpreted, and showed by the spirituality, usually called the English Church, which, both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of numbers, is sufficient without exterior persons Therefore it decrees that all matters of spiritual jurisdiction shall be dealt with wholly

within the realm and in the episcopal courts, but if the matter touches the King appeal shall lie to Convocation

(4) 1533. *An Act for the Punishment of Heresy* (25 Hen VIII, c. 14).

After repealing the Act 2 Hen IV, c. 15, against heresy but confirming and re-enacting 5 Ric. II, c 5 and 2 Hen V, stat. 1, c. 7 on the same subject, it proceeds ‘and whereas the great number of the king’s subjects, having little or no learning nor knowledge of letters, have been put in opinion that by divers laws decrees ordinances and constitutions heretofore made by the Bishop of Rome called the Pope and his predecessors or by their authorities for the advancement of their worldly glory and ambition, every man that in any thing thinketh or speaketh or doth against the said pretended power or authority of the same Bishop of Rome, or any of the said laws, standeth in danger and is impeachable of heresy . . . be it enacted and ordained . that no manner of speaking doing communication or holding against the said Bishop of Rome or his pretended power . . . shall be deemed reputed . . . to be heresy.’

(5) 1533. *Submission of the Clergy and the Restraint of Appeals* (25 Hen. VIII, c. 19).

Convocation is henceforth to be assembled only by the King’s writ. The clergy may not enact any canon or ordinance unless they have the King’s permission to do so. No appeal of any kind is in future to go to the court of Rome. Appeals from the archbishop’s court are to be made to the King in Chancery, who is in each case to appoint a commission of judges to hear the case (*Court of Delegates*). Those who violate this Act, and all who aid and abet the same, fall under the pains of *Praemunire*.

(6) 1533. *Act for the Non-payment of First-Fruits to the Bishop of Rome* (25 Hen. VIII, c. 20).

The payment of Annates to the see of Rome on appointment to a bishopric or archbishopric is to cease. For the future no one on his election to such office is to apply to Rome for Bull of appointment or for Pallium. The chapter of a cathedral shall elect the person named in the King’s letters missive. If they

fail to do so, the King's nomination shall suffice Those who violate the Act, and their aiders and abettors, fall under the pains of *Praemunire*.

- (7) 1533 *Act concerning Peter-pence and Dispensations* (25 Hen. VIII, c 21).

Peter's pence and all other payments to the see of Rome are to cease No further application is to be made to Rome for any faculty or any dispensation from the canon law. Customary dispensations are to be granted by the archbishop of Canterbury. Those which are not customary can only be granted by the King or his Council

- (8) 1534. *The King to be accepted as Supreme Head of the Ecclesia Anglicana* (26 Hen. VIII, c 1)

The King is to be accounted the Supreme Head of the Church in England, to enjoy all the jurisdiction and authority pertaining to that dignity, with full power to correct all errors and heresies.

- (9) 1534 *An Act of the Convocation of York.*

Declares their unanimous acceptance of the conclusion that 'the Bishop of Rome according to Sacred Scripture has no greater jurisdiction in the realm of England than has any other foreign Bishop'.

The Convocation of Canterbury had already made a similar declaration to the King.

- (10) 1536. *An Act suppressing the smaller Monasteries* (27 Hen. VIII, c. 28).

'Forasmuch as manifest sin . . . is daily committed among the little and small abbeys priories and other religious houses . . . where the congregation . . . is under the number of twelve persons . . . in consideration whereof the king's most royal majesty being supreme head in earth under God of the Church of England . . . and considering also that divers and great solemn monasteries wherein thanks be to God Religion is right well kept and observed be destitute of such full numbers . . . as

they ought and may keep the Lords and commons desire that it may be enacted that his majesty . shall have and enjoy . . . for ever all such monasteries . . which have not . above the clear yearly value of £200 . and that the king's highness shall have and enjoy to his own proper use all the ornaments jewels . . which appertained to any of the chief governors of the said monasteries in the right of the said monasteries '

- (11) 1536 *An Act extinguishing the Authority of the Bishop of Rome* (28 Hen. VIII, c. 10).

Any person who by writing or preaching shall uphold the authority or jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome as it was used, claimed, or usurped heretofore shall incur the penalties of *Praemunire*. Justices of Assize, Justices of the Peace, and Bishops shall inquire into such practices and present those who do them to the King's Bench or to the Star Chamber. Temporal and spiritual officers are to take oath utterly to refuse, relinquish, and forsake the Bishop of Rome and his authority, power, and jurisdiction.

- (12) 1539. *An Act suppressing the larger Monasteries* (31 Hen. VIII, c. 13).

'Where sundry abbots . . . have of their own free and voluntary minds . . . given and granted . . . all their said monasteries . . to our sovereign lord. . . Be it enacted that all such monasteries are dissolved . and all their property vested in the king.'

- (13) 1539. *An Act abolishing Diversity in Opinions* (31 Hen. VIII, c. 14).

Since the King is 'by God's law, supreme head immediately under Him of this whole Church and Congregation of England' he has proposed to Parliament and Convocation the discussion of six opinions touching religion As a result of those discussions it is now decided.

- i. That after the consecration the substance of bread and wine do not remain.

- 2 That by God's law communion under both kinds is not necessary.
- 3 That by the law of God priests should be celibate.
- 4 That vows of chastity may be rightly taken and, being taken, should be kept
- 5 That private Masses are meet and necessary by God's law.
6. That auricular confession is expedient and necessary.

It is therefore enacted that any one who teaches contrary opinions is to be adjudged heretic and is to be burned, and that any priest or person under a vow of chastity who marries is guilty of a felony

- (14) 1540. *An Act concerning Christ's Religion* (32 Hen. VIII, c. 26).

'Any definition . . . set forth by the persons now appointed or hereafter to be appointed by his Royal Majesty, or else by the whole clergy in and upon matters of Christ's religion and the christian faith . . . shall be in every point limitation and circumstance by all his grace's subjects fully believed obeyed observed' upon the pains and penalties set forth in the Letters Patent confirming the definition.

- (15) 1545. *An Act for Doctors of Civil Law to exercise Spiritual Jurisdiction* (37 Hen. VIII, c. 17).

The King 'as the only and undoubtedly supreme head of the Church of England and also of Ireland to whom by Holy Scripture all authority and power is wholly given to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical, and to correct vice and sin' enacts that such lay and married persons, being doctors of civil law, as he appoints may lawfully exercise all manner of jurisdiction commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

EDWARD VI

- (16) 1547. *An Act concerning the Sacrament of the Altar* (1 Edw. VI, c. 1).

Those who speak or act disrespectfully of the sacrament of

638 LEGISLATION OF THE CHANGE OF RELIGION
the altar are to be imprisoned and fined. The sacrament is to be administered under both kinds.

(17) 1547 *Act concerning Certain Treasons* (1 Edw. VI, c. 12).

By §§ 6, 7 of this Act all who by writing or printing maintain that the King should not be Supreme Head of the Church are made liable to the penalties of high treason. Any one who maintains the same in word only is, for a first offence, to suffer imprisonment during the King's pleasure, for a second offence, imprisonment for life; for a third offence, the penalties of high treason.

All the acts against heretical opinions in force under Henry VIII are repealed.

(18) 1547 *The Chantries Act* (1 Edw. VI, c. 14)

All colleges, chantries, and chapels are declared to be in the actual seisin and possession of the King with all their lands and revenues. Exception is made of the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge and a few others named, and the Act applies not to cathedrals but only to their chantries.

(19) 1548. *Act for Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments* (2 & 3 Edw. VI, c. 1).

The First Prayer Book of Edward VI. A vernacular liturgy is introduced; the use of the old service books is made a penal offence, a third conviction renders the offender subject to imprisonment for life.

(20) 1548 *An Act to take away all Positive Laws against the Marriage of Priests* (2 & 3 Edw. VI, c. 21).

All prohibitions against the marrying of priests are declared void.

(21) 1549 *An Act for Abolishing and Putting Away of Divers Books and Images* (3 & 4 Edw. VI, c. 10).

All books formerly used in the services of the Church, whether in Latin or English, and all images must be defaced or sur-

rendered. Those who retain such books or images undefaced incur penalties rising to imprisonment at the King's pleasure But images of those who were not reputed to be saints may be kept undefaced.

(22) 1552. *Act for the Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments* (5 & 6 Edw VI, c. 1).

The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Attendance at this form of worship on all Sundays and Holy-days declared obligatory under pain of the censures of the Church. All who shall be present at any other form of worship shall suffer, for a first offence, imprisonment for six months; for a second, imprisonment for a year, for a third, imprisonment for life

This Book of Common Prayer marked the official adoption of doctrines of the continental Reformers. The First Book was a preparatory measure. It omitted all mention of sacrifice, but contained expressions compatible with a belief in the Real Presence. In Cranmer's Second Book the Real Presence was explicitly denied. Invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary were excluded. Two Sacraments only were recognized. In the new Ordinal a Protestant 'ministry of the word' was substituted for the ancient priesthood. Protestantism became the State religion.

(23) 1552. *An Act for the Punishment of Treasons* (5 & 6 Edw. VI, c. 11).

Any one expressly affirming that the King is a heretic, schismatic tyrant, infidel, or usurper incurs penalties rising to those against high treason.

MARY

(24) 1553. *An Act for the Repealing of certain Laws* (1 Mary, stat 2, c. 2).

Repeals all the legislation of Edward VI concerning religion. It renders all who disturb the Mass or deface images liable to imprisonment for three months.

- (25) 1554. *An Act for restoring the Authority of the Pope* (1 & 2 Phil. & Mary, c. 8).

Repeals all statutes and provisions made against the See Apostolic of Rome since the twentieth year of the reign of Hen VIII Establishes the title of all spiritual and ecclesiastical possessions conveyed to laymen since that year.

ELIZABETH

- (26) 1559. *Act of Supremacy* (1 Eliz. c 1).

The spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope restored by Queen Mary is repudiated. The statutes 25 Hen VIII, cc. 19, 20, 21 (*supra* (5), (6), (7)) are revived Spiritual jurisdiction is annexed to the Crown. The Queen is empowered to nominate such persons as she may see fit to exercise spiritual jurisdiction in her name (Court of High Commission). All bishops and ministers, all lay-officers of the Crown must take the Oath of Supremacy, recognizing the Queen as Supreme Governor in spiritual causes, as in temporal. Any one who shall maintain the spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope within the realm shall, for a first offence, suffer the loss of all his goods and chattels, real and personal, for a second offence, incur the pains of *Praemunire*, for a third offence, those of high treason.

The term 'Supreme Head' of the Church was not employed, since contemporary opinion regarded the claim that a woman should be Head of the Church as unreasonable. The Queen was expressly declared to be the source of spiritual jurisdiction, and the bishops on appointment received their jurisdiction from her.

- (27) 1559. *Act of Uniformity* (1 Eliz. c. 2).

The statute 5 & 6 Edw. VI, c. 1 (*supra* (22)) is revived, and the Prayer Book of 1552 reimposed. Attendance at Church to be compulsory, a fine of one shilling to be paid each time for every person absent. Severe penalties are incurred by any one speaking against the book or any ministers refusing to use it. A third conviction entails imprisonment for life.

- (28) 1559. *An Act to annex to the Crown certain Religious Houses*
(1 Eliz. c. 24)

All the monasteries and religious houses founded in the reign of Queen Mary are annexed to the Crown.

- (29) 1563. *Act for the Assurance of the Queen's Royal Power* (5 Eliz. c. 1).

All who maintain the Pope's authority within the realm fall under the penalties of *Praemunire*. Not merely Justices of Assize but Justices of the Peace are to inquire into offences against the Act, and are bound to certify any presentment made to them to the King's Bench within forty days. The Oath of Supremacy is imposed on a greatly extended list of persons, including all who take degrees at the universities, all who take degrees in the Common Law, all barristers and attorneys, and all public and private teachers of children. A first refusal to take the Oath entails the pains of *Praemunire*; a second those of high treason.

- (30) 1566. *An Act declaring the manner of making Archbishops and Bishops to be good, lawful, and perfect* (8 Eliz. c. 1).

Because many of the common sort doubt whether the consecrations were due and orderly done, it is enacted that all the acts of those consecrated according to the Act of Uniformity shall be by authority of this Parliament declared good and perfect to all respects and purposes.

- (31) 1571. *An Act whereby certain offences be made Treason* (13 Eliz. c. 1).

All who 'maliciously advisedly and directly hold the opinion' that the queen is a heretic, schismatical tyrant, infidel, or usurper of the Crown are guilty of high treason. Those who aid or comfort them incur the penalty of *Praemunire* for the first offence, of high treason for the second.

- (32) 1571. *An Act against the bringing in and putting into execution of Bulls from the See of Rome* (13 Eliz. c. 2).

Those who make use of any bull from the Bishop of Rome,

and those who give or receive absolution in virtue of such a bull, shall be guilty of high treason.

Those who import or receive crosses, pictures, beads, or *agnus dei* from the See of Rome incur the penalties of *Praemunire*.

(33) 1581. *Act to Retain the Queen's Subjects in their Obedience*
(23 Eliz c 1).

Any person who seeks to bring any subject of the Queen to leave the religion now established and promise obedience to the Pope, and any person promising such obedience, shall be accounted guilty of high treason.

Any person knowing of such offence, and failing to disclose it to a Justice of the Peace within twenty days, shall be accounted guilty of misprision of treason.

Any person who shall say Mass shall forfeit two hundred marks and suffer imprisonment for a year; and any one hearing Mass shall forfeit one hundred marks and suffer imprisonment for a year.

Any person failing to attend worship in his parish church shall be fined twenty pounds for every month during which he absents himself.

Any person keeping a schoolmaster who does not come to the parish church shall be fined ten pounds every month on this account.

One-third of the fines due under this Act shall be paid to the informer.

(34) 1585. *Act against Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and other Disobedient Persons* (27 Eliz. c. 2).

Any Jesuit or seminary priest entering the kingdom shall be held guilty of high treason; and any one willingly receiving or aiding such persons shall suffer death as a felon.

Any person being brought up at a Jesuit college or seminary beyond the seas, who does not return to England and take the Oath of Supremacy, shall, if he should return subsequently, be accounted guilty of high treason.

Failure to inform against a priest is punishable by fine and imprisonment at the Queen's pleasure.

Any one sending his child or ward out of the country without special licence shall forfeit one hundred pounds.

(35) 1593. *Act for Restraining Popish Recusants to certain places of abode* (35 Eliz. c. 2).

All Popish recusants shall repair to their place of abode, and shall not at any time remove five miles from thence. Offenders against this Act shall forfeit all their lands, goods, and chattels to the Queen.

All Popish recusant copyholders forfeit their lands to their lord or, if he is also a Popish recusant, to the Crown. All Popish recusants who have not freehold of the clear yearly value of 20 marks are to abjure the realm and if they refuse are to be deemed felons.

JAMES I

(36) 1603. *An Act against Popish Recusants* (1 James I, c. 4).

All the Elizabethan statutes against Catholicism confirmed and re-enacted. Further, persons sent to Popish colleges abroad are declared incapable of inheritance.

CALENDAR OF THE DECREES BY WHICH THE CHANGE OF RELIGION WAS EFFECTED IN SCOTLAND

A. IN THE 'PARLIAMENT' AT EDINBURGH 1560¹

(1) 'The 24th day of the said month of August, the three estates then being present, understanding that the jurisdiction and authority of the Bishop of Rome called the Pope, used within this realm in the times byepast, has been very hurtful and prejudicial to our sovereign's authority and common weal of this realm,

'Therefore has statute and ordained that the Bishop of Rome have no jurisdiction nor authority within this realm in times coming,

'and that none of our said sovereign's subjects of this realm suit or desire in any time hereafter title or right by the said Bishop of Rome or his sect to anything within this realm, under the pain of barratry, that is to say, proscription banishment and never to brook honour office nor dignity within this realm.

'And the contraveners hereof to be called before the justice or his depute, or before the lords of session, and punished therefore conformably to the laws of this realm,

'And the furnishers of them with finance of money and purchasers of their title of right or maintainers or defenders of them shall incur the same pains.

'And that no bishop nor other prelate of this realm use any jurisdiction in times to come by the said Bishop of Rome's authority under the pain aforesaid.

(2) 'The which day forasmuch as there has been divers and sundry acts of Parliament made in King James the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth's times, kings of Scotland for the time, and also in our sovereign lady's time, not agreeing with God's holy word, and by them divers persons took occasion of maintenance of idolatry and superstition in the Kirk of God, and

¹ The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland printed for the Records Commission (1814).

repressing of such persons as were professors of the said word, wherethrough divers innocents did suffer,

'for eschewing of such in time coming, the threc estates of Parliament have annulled and declared all such acts made in times byepast not agreeing with God's word, and now contrary to the confession of our faith according to the said word published in this Parliament, to be of none avail, force nor effect. And discerns the said acts and every one of them to have no effect nor strength in time to come, but the same to be abolished and extinct for ever in so far as any of the said acts are repugnant and contrary to the confession and word of God foresaid, ratified and approved by the said estates in this present parliament.

(3) 'The which day, forasmuch as Almighty God by his most true and blessed word has declared the reverence and honour which should be given to him, and by his son Jesus Christ has declared the true use of the sacraments, willing the same to be used according to his will and word, by the which it is notorious and perfectly known, that the sacrament of baptism and of the body and blood of Jesus Christ has been in all times byepast corrupted by the papistical kirk by their usurped ministers; and p[re]sently, notwithstanding the reformation already made according to God's word, yet not the less there is some of the same Pope's Kirk that stubbornly persevere in their wicked idolatry, saying Mass, and baptizing conformably to the Pope's kirk, profaning threthrough the sacraments foresaid in quiet and secret places, regarding therethrough neither God nor his Holy word.

'Therefore it is statute and ordained in this present parliament that no manner of person or persons in any times coming administer any of the sacraments foresaid secretly, or in any other manner of way but they that are admitted and having power to that effect,

'And that no manner of person nor persons say Mass nor yet hear Mass nor be present thereat under pain of confiscation of all their goods moveable and immoveable, and the punishing of their bodies at the discretion of the magistrate within whose jurisdiction such persons happen to be apprehended, for the

first fault; banishing of the realm for the second fault; and justifying to the death for the third fault.

'And ordains all sheriffs stewards bailies and their deputes, provosts and bailies of boroughs and other judges whatsoever within this realm to take diligent search and inquisition within their bounds where any such usurped ministry is used, mass saying, or they that be present at the doing thereof, ratifying and approving the same, and take and apprehend them to the effect that the pains above-written may be execute upon them.'

B. IN THE ASSEMBLY AT EDINBURGH 1567¹

(4) 'The noblemen, barons and others undersubscribing in this present assembly of the Kirk of God have agreed and condescended to the articles after following, at Edinburgh 25th July 1567,

.

'Item, the nobility barons and others of the Kirk, undersubscribing in the presence of God, have faithfully promised to convene themselves together with their power and forces and there to root out, destroy, and all-utterly subvert all monuments of idolatry, and namely the odious and blasphemous Mass,

'and thereafter to go forward throughout this whole realm to all and sundry places wheresoever idolatry is fostered hautit or maintained, and chiefly where Mass is said, to execute the reformation foresaid without exception of place or person . . .

'and also shall proceed to the punishment of the idolaters according to the laws thereafter pronounced . . .

'and in this manner, promise faithfully to reform the schools colleges, and universities throughout this whole realm, and to expel and remove the idolaters that have charges thereof.'

C. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1567

(5) By cap. 3, 4, and 5, the Acts of the 'Parliament' of 1560 (*supra*, nos. (1), (2) and (3)) were ratified and re-enacted.

(6) Cap. 6. Those ministers who accept and act on the Con-

¹ *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, vol. 1, p. 534

fession of faith, and those who agree with them, are declared to be the only true and holy kirk of Jesus Christ within this realm.

Those who will not agree with them are no members of the said Kirk.

(7) Cap. 9. No one henceforth is to be admitted to bear public office, or to be a notary, unless he make profession of belief according to the confession of faith

(8) Cap. 11. No one is to be allowed to teach in schools or universities, nor to instruct youths privately, unless he be approved by the superintendents and visitors of the Kirk.

D. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1572

(9) Cap 2 'Because the education of our sovereign lord is in the true religion of Jesus Christ, and because it is godly and expedient that all his highness's subjects worship the only true God in the uniformity of religion and his highness's obedience,

'Therefore, all these, men and women, suspected to be papists, or who do not communicate with the sacraments as they are now ministered in the reformed kirk, are to be noted, to be warned to recant their papistical errors, to make public profession of the confession of faith, and to participate in the sacraments of the reformed kirk.'

If they will not do so they are to be excommunicated.

The disobedient, the obstinate, and those who have returned to papistry shall be held infamous, unable to plead in the courts of law, or to sue, or to appear as witnesses against those professing the true religion.

(10) Cap 3. All those who minister and all those who hold any living or ecclesiastical pension must publicly conform to the established kirk. Otherwise they shall be *ipso facto* deprived, and all their ecclesiastical livings vacant, as if they were naturally dead.

(11) Cap. 4. No one shall be reputed a loyal and faithful subject to our said sovereign lord or his authority, but shall be punishable as a rebel, who will not give his confession, and make profession of the said true religion.

(12) Cap. 14 All persons excommunicated by order of the kirk, who are not reconciled within forty days, are to submit themselves to the discipline of the kirk under the pain of being rebels.

E. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1579

(13) Cap. 9. Because some of the youth of this realm passing to parts beyond the seas become corrupted in religion,

Therefore, before any go abroad to gain knowledge in letters they shall obtain royal letters of licence which shall contain a provision that they remain constant in the established religion of this realm.

And within twenty days of returning they shall offer to make the Confession of faith by law established.

If they fail they are to be pursued as the enemies of the true religion.

F. IN THE PARLIAMENT HELD AT EDINBURGH 1581

(14) Cap. 6. 'Because the dregs of idolatry yet remain in divers parts of the realm, the using of pilgrimages to chapels wells crosses and such like monuments of idolatry,

'And because men still observe the festival days of the saints, sometime named their patrons, with bonfires, carol singing, and observing of such other superstitions and papistical rites,

'Therefore it is statute that those who do so shall incur the following pains:

'For the first offence. if they be landed gentry 100 pounds, if unlanded 100 marks, if seamen 40 pounds.

For the second offence death as idolaters.'

All magistrates are to search out such as use these papistical observances. If the offenders are not able to pay the fines, they are to be kept in prison, in irons or the stocks, and to be fed on bread and water for a month.

(15) Cap. 8. 'Because certain papists pass out of the realm to the schools, and strive to pervert the youth of this nation from the religion established by parliament, and make and disperse books in defence of the Pope and his authority,

And returning to this country strive to seduce the people to their superstitious and erroneous doctrine,

'It is statute that all such who do not subscribe the articles of the established religion within forty days shall incur the pain of banishment and confiscation of goods.'

G. IN THE PARLIAMENT HELD AT PERTH 1584

(16) Cap. 2. 'Because sundry have declined the judgement of his highness and his council

'Therefore our royal sovereign and the three estates confirm the royal power and authority over all states as well spiritual as temporal within this realm.

'And declare that the king and his council are judges competent in all matters and that none shall decline the judgement of his highness under pain of treason.'

H. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1587

(17) Cap. 3. That all Jesuits and seminary priests found in the realm within a month after the publication of the acts of this parliament shall be apprehended, and shall incur the pain of death and confiscation of all their moveable goods.

All those who help them knowingly, and all who hear Mass, or refuse to resort to the preaching, or decline from the established religion, or persuade others to do so, shall incur the pain of tressail of all their moveable goods with the life rents of their lands and livings.

(18) Cap. 4. Because papistical books are being brought into the realm, it shall be lawful for any minister or magistrate to make search for them and to destroy them, and those who have brought them into the country shall be punished in person and goods at our sovereign Lord's will.

J. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1592

(19) Cap. 14. 'That in all time coming the saying of Mass, receiving of Jesuits seminary priests trafficking papists against the king's majesty and religion presently professed within this realm, is and shall be a just cause to infer the pain and crime

of treason, both against the Jesuits, Mass priests, trafficking papists, and receivers of them.

K. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1594

(20) Cap. 3 'All wilful hearers of Mass and concealers thereof in all time coming shall be execute to the death, and their goods and gear escheated to his highness's use'

(21) Cap. 4 All suspected of papistry are to appear before the Presbyteries If they will not they are to be reported to the Privy Council, and unless they satisfy the presbytery their moveable goods and life rents are escheated to the Crown

And all who receive them, supply them with food, or entertain them shall suffer the like penalty.

L. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1600

(22) Cap. 26. Those who do not receive communion once a year according to the established rite shall incur the following penalties: if an earl 1,000 pounds, if a lord 1,000 marks, if a baron 500 pounds, if a freeholder 300 marks, if a yeoman 40 pounds, if a burgess, according as the king and his secret Council decree.

M. IN THE PARLIAMENT AT EDINBURGH 1609

(23) Cap. 3. No nobleman's son is to be sent out of the country with a pedagogue except the latter obtain a testimonial from the bishop of the diocese Penalty for an earl 5,000 pounds, for a lord 5,000 marks, for a baron 3,000 marks.

(24) Cap. 4. If any man's son, while abroad, shall haunt the exercises of a contrary religion, the parents shall find caution that they will not furnish their children with anything necessary or comfortable for them after that it be known that the said children are become papists.

(25) Cap. 5. No person excommunicated for not conforming himself to the established religion shall be suffered directly, or indirectly by others, to enjoy the possession of his lands, rents, or revenues.

CALENDAR OF THE DECREES BY WHICH THE CHANGE OF RELIGION WAS ATTEMPTED IN IRELAND

HENRY VIII

- (1) 1536. *Act of Supreme Head of the Church in Ireland* (28 Hen VIII, c. 5).¹

'Forasmuch as this land of Ireland is depending and belonging justly and rightfully to the imperial crown of England, for increase of virtue in Christ's religion within the said land of Ireland, and to repress and extirp all errors, heresies, and other enormities and abuses, heretofore used in the same; be it enacted by authority of this present Parliament,—That the King our Sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, Kings of the said realm of England, and lords of this said land of Ireland, shall be accepted, taken, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the whole church of Ireland, (called *Hibernica Ecclesia*) . . . any usage, custom, foreign laws, foreign authority, prescription, or any other thing or things to the contrary notwithstanding.'

- (2) 1536. *Act of Appeals* (28 Hen. VIII, c. 6).

'That no person or persons, subjects or residents of this land, shall from the first day of this present Parliament pursue, commence, use or execute any manner of provocations, appeals, or other process, to or from the bishop of Rome, or from the See of Rome, or to or from any other that claim authority by reason of the same, for any manner of ease, grief, or cause, of what nature soever it be, upon the pain that the offenders, their aiders, counsellors, and abettors, contrary to this act, shall incur and run into such pains, forfeitures, and penaltics, as be specified and contained in the act of provision and premunire, made in the realm of England in the 16th year of King Richard II . . . against such as procure to the court of Rome or elsewhere to the derogation or contrary to the prerogative or jurisdiction of the said crown of England . . . nor in any wise obey or execute

¹ The Acts referred to in this section are those of the Dublin Parliament.

within this land such manner of process, upon like pains or forfeits as be above rehearsed '

It was further enacted that all such appeals in future shall be made 'to the King of England and lord of Ireland . . . (who) shall grant a commission or delegacy to some discreet and well learned persons of this land of Ireland, or else in the realm of England, for final determination of all causes and griefs contained in the said provocations and appeals'.

- (3) 1537. *Act against the Proctors of Bishops in Parliament* (29 Hen. VIII, c. 12).

The two proctors from each diocese severally, who had usually been summoned to Parliament, composed a formidable body, avowed adherents of the Holy See. They claimed to be members of the legislative body, and to have a full right of suffrage in every public question, 'to the only intent', says the Act, 'that the said proctors should be the stop and let that the devilish abuses, and usurped authority and jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome (by some men called the Pope) nor of themselves should not come to light or knowledge, that some good and godly reformation thereof might be had and provided. Wherefore be it enacted . . . that the said proctors nor any of them . . . is nor shall be any member nor parcel of the body of the same Parliament.'

- (4) 1537. *Act Against the Authority of the Bishop of Rome* (29 Hen. VIII, c. 13).

Not content with the Act of Supremacy, Parliament was called upon to pass more positive legislation 'for the extirpation, abolition, and extinguishment out of this land, of the pretended power, and usurped authority of the bishop of Rome (by some called the Pope) used within the same, which did obfuscate and wrest God's holy word and testament a long season from the spiritual and true meaning thereof, to his worldly and carnal affection, as pomp, glory, avarice, ambition and tyranny, covering and shadowing the same with his humane and crafty devices, traditions, and inventions set forth under the cloak of

virtue, only to promote and establish his dominion as well both upon the souls and bodies, as also upon the temporal goods of all Christian people, excluding not only Christ out of his kingdom and rule of man's soul as much as they might, but also other temporal Kings and princes out of their dominions which they ought to have by God's law, upon the bodies and goods of their subjects, whereby he did not only rob the King's majesty, being the only head of the realm of England, and of this his land of Ireland immediately under God, of his honour, right, and pre-eminence due unto him by the law of God, but also spoiled this his land of Ireland yearly of innumerable treasure . . . any person . . . (who shall) by any deed or act, obstinately or maliciously hold or stand with to maintain or defend the authority, jurisdiction or power of the bishop of Rome . . . shall incur and run into the dangers, penalties, pains, and forfeitures ordained and provided by the Statute of Provision and Pre-munire, made in the 16th year of King Richard the Second.'

Every ecclesiastical and temporal official shall take a corporal oath upon the Gospels 'that he from henceforth shall utterly renounce, refuse, relinquish, and forsake the bishop of Rome, and his authority, power, and jurisdiction; . . . he shall resist the same at all times to the uttermost of his power, and that from henceforth he shall accept, repute, and take the King's Majesty to be the only Supreme Head in earth of the Church of England and of Ireland'.

(5) 1537. *Act for the First-Fruits* (29 Hen. VIII, c. 8).

'Considering the great decay of the King's revenues within this his Grace's land and dominion of Ireland' the King shall have 'the first-fruits, revenues, and profits for one year, of every archbishopric, bishopric, prebend.'

A similar Act was passed in reference to the first-fruits of abbeys, priories, colleges, &c., 'for the better augmentation of the King's revenues within this land'.

(6) 1537. *Act for the Twentieth Part* (29 Hen. VIII, c. 14).

For the maintenance of the royal estate of the Imperial

Crown and the dignity as Supreme Head of the Church of England and of Ireland it was enacted that the King 'shall yearly have forever one yearly rent or pension amounting to the value of the 20th part of all the revenues, as well spiritual as temporal, appertaining to any archbishopric, bishopric, abbacy, monastery &c., or other benefice or promotion spiritual within any diocese of this land'.

- (7) 1537. *Act for Suppression of Religious Houses* (29 Hen. VIII, c. 16).

This Act referred only to thirteen houses, and was probably intended as a preliminary to the Greater Suppression: 'All ornaments, jewels, &c., shall be given to the King.'

- (8) 1537. *Act of Faculties*

This Act recites the English Act of 3 Nov. 21 Hen VIII against the payment of Peter's pence, payment for episcopal bulls, dispensations, licences, faculties, &c. The Chancellor of Ireland is to have the same authority in these matters as the Chancellor of England. The King was to receive half the taxes, the Archbishop of Canterbury one-third, the Irish Chancery one-sixth.

- (9) 1539. *Royal Commission for Suppression of Religious Houses*.

The Commissioners were ordered to search where were 'any notable images or reliques' which they should break up and remove, to take the surrender of any monasteries and religious houses, the same to be made 'freely' into the hand of the King; to sell the movable goods, 'except vessels of silver and gold, jewels, principal ornaments, lead and bells', which were for 'the need and use of the same lord the King'; 'to apprehend and punish such as adhere to the usurped authority of the Romish Pontiff, and contumaciously refuse to surrender their houses'.

- (10) 1560. *Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity* (2 Eliz. c. 12, 3).

Firstly. An Act 'restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdic-

tion (i.e. Henry VIII's) over the state, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abrogating all foreign power repugnant to the same'.

Acts of Appeals and Faculties are revived.

Acts of Philip and Mary against heresy are repealed.

All officers and ministers, ecclesiastical and lay, shall take the Oath of Supremacy.

First offence of maintaining foreign jurisdiction shall be punished with loss of goods; the second shall be *Praemunire*; the third, high treason.

Secondly. An Act for 'Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and the administration of the Sacraments'.

Thirdly. An Act for restitution of first-fruits and twentieths of ecclesiastical benefices to the Crown.

Fourthly. The Queen shall appoint to bishoprics by letters patent without the *Congé d'élire*.

Fifthly. An Act of recognition of the Queen's title.

Sixthly. To say that the Queen has no right to the Crown incurs the pains of *Praemunire*, to write it incurs those of treason.

This was the first occasion on which the Second Book of Common Prayer, 1552, was authorized in Ireland. The penalties for non-attendance at Protestant worship were much the same as those laid down in the English Acts.

(Since the legislation of the sixteenth century failed of its intended effect, the governments of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries continued to make penal Statutes against Catholicism.)

(ii) 1605, 4th July *Royal Proclamation against Toleration*.

King James repudiated the idea prevailing in Ireland that he intended 'to give liberty of conscience or toleration of religion to his subjects in that kingdom contrary to the express laws and statutes therein enacted'. 'All priests whatsoever made and ordained by any authority derived or pretended to be derived from the See of Rome shall, before the 10th day of December, depart out of the kingdom of Ireland'

(12) 1692. *Parliament violates the Treaty of Limerick.*

The Articles of Limerick, signed on the 13th October 1691, were of two kinds—military and civil. The former permitted any soldier or officer who did not desire to remain in Ireland as a subject of King William, to leave and betake himself to the Continent, carrying with him his family and movable personal property. The civil articles were thirteen in all, the principal of which were as follows.

1. 'The Roman Catholics of this kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland, or as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles II, and their Majesties, as soon as their affairs will permit them to summon a parliament in this kingdom, will endeavour to procure the said Roman Catholics such further security in that particular as may preserve them from any disturbance upon the account of their said religion.'

2 All inhabitants of Limerick or of the other places which still remained in the hands of the Irish, as well as all officers and soldiers in the counties of Limerick, Clare, Kerry, Cork, and Mayo who held commissions from King James who were then in Ireland, and were not prisoners of war or who had 'taken protection', should enjoy their estates, personal property, and privileges, and should exercise their callings and professions without hindrance, in the same way as they had done during the reign of Charles II, provided that they should not 'neglect or refuse to take the oath of allegiance made by the parliament in England required in the first year of their present Majesties, upon being thereupon required'.

4 and 5 released the persons comprised in Article 2 from any penalties which they might be considered to have incurred by their adherence to James.

9 laid down that 'the oath to be administered to such Roman Catholics as submit to their Majesties' Government shall be the oath above-said and no other' (i.e. as in Article 2)

12 'The Lords Justices and Generals do undertake that their Majesties will ratify these articles within the space of eight

months or sooner, and use their utmost endeavours that the same shall be ratified by and confirmed by parliament.'

The ambiguity of Articles 1 and 2 gave the Ascendancy Party the desired opportunity of violating them in the Parliament of 1692. Article 9 was also violated by the substitution of the oath imposed by the English Act of 1691 which denied the spiritual jurisdiction 'within this realm' of any foreign Person, Prince, Prelate, or Potentate (including the Pope). Article 7 was likewise broken by disarming the Catholics.

The Parliament of 1697 went still farther. It decided that the position which the Catholics were entitled to 'enjoy' was that to which the persecuting laws, still unrepealed in the days of Charles II, condemned them.

(13) 1697. *An Act for Banishing all Papists exercising any Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, and all Regulars of the Popish Clergy out of this Kingdom* (9 William III, c. 26).

All Archbishops, Bishops, &c., and Regular Clergy are to depart this kingdom and repair to certain places on the coast until there shall be conveniency for shipping for their Transportation beyond seas; and from the 29th December next being the year 1697 no Popish Archbishop, &c., or any Popish Clergy shall come into this kingdom on pain of imprisonment and transportation, and if any such Ecclesiastical person shall again return he shall be guilty of high treason and suffer accordingly.

Any person harbouring or relieving them shall be heavily fined or in default imprisoned.

There shall be a penalty of £10 on any person burying the dead, or assisting at the ceremony, in any suppressed monastery.

It is further enacted that Justices of the Peace shall issue warrants for apprehending and committing all Popish Ecclesiastical Persons whatsoever that shall continue in this Kingdom and they shall give an account in writing of their proceedings in execution of this Statute, and the neglect of this duty renders them liable to a forfeiture of £100, and disabled from serving as Justices of the Peace.

- (14) 1697. *An Act to prevent Protestants Intermarrying with Papists* (9 William III, c. 28).

Such Protestant so marrying and the person she shall marry shall forever be rendered incapable of inheriting any estates or interests or being the heir, executor, administrator, or guardian of or to any Protestants whatsoever.

Any Minister performing such ceremony of marriage shall suffer one year's imprisonment and forfeit £20.

- (15) 1703. *An Act to prevent Popish Priests from coming into this Kingdom* (2 Anne, c. 3).

Severe penalties on any harbourer or reliever of such persons Justices failing to report their presence are to be fined £100 and disabled from official service for life.

- (16) 1704. *An Act to prevent the further growth of Popery* (2 Anne, c. 6).

Penalty for raising Divisions by Papists in Voting for Members of Parliament, for converting any Protestant, for sending any child beyond the sea Provision to be made for maintenance of Protestant children. If the eldest son is a Protestant, the Popish parent shall be his tenant for life in all the real estate in which he shall then be seized in fee tail or fee simple No Popish parent shall have the education or guardianship of his children, nor can he be the guardian of orphans.

Intermarriages forbidden.

No Papist may purchase a lease either in his own name or another's above thirty-one years.

All estates of Papists to be in gavelkind, that is, the sons to share equally the inheritance, and the daughters likewise, notwithstanding any grant, disposition by will, or otherwise to the contrary.

No Papist to purchase any house or tenement or dwell within Limerick or Galway.

No Papist to vote for electing Members of Parliament unless

he take the Oath of Abjuration. Pilgrimages to holy places forbidden

- (17) 1704 *An Act for Registering the Popish Clergy, Dublin* (2 Anne, c. 7).

Whereas two Acts lately made for banishing the Popish clergy and preventing their coming into the Kingdom may be wholly eluded without a true registration of their number, it is enacted that every such priest shall return his name and abode to the respective Clerks of the Peace with names of two Sureties who will answer for them that they are of 'peaceable behaviour and will not remove out of the County'.

Further, no Popish Priest shall have any Curate or Assistant.

Neglect of registration involves severe penalties.

- (18) 1717 *An Act for the better Regulating the Town of Galway, and for strengthening the Protestant Interest therein* (4 George, c. 15).

No persons shall enjoy the freedom of the town unless they have been professed Protestants for seven years previously.

- (19) 1725. *An Act to Prevent Marriages by Degraded Clergymen and Popish Priests, and for preventing marriages consummated from being avoided by Precontracts, and for the more effectual Punishing of Bigamy* (12 George, c. 3).

If any Popish Priest celebrate any marriage between two Protestants or reputed Protestants he shall be guilty of felony and shall suffer death as a felon without Benefit of Clergy or of the Statute.

- (20) 1734. *An Act for the Amendment of the Law, in Relation to Popish Solicitors; And for Remedyng other Mischiefs, in Relation to the Practitioners in the several Courts of Law and Equity* (7 George II, c. 5).

No person is to be admitted an Attorney or licensed to be a Solicitor, who has not been a Protestant from the age of 14 years, or two years before he became an apprentice—Affidavits to be made before a person of the Protestant religion.

- (21) 1734. *An Act to prevent Persons Converted from the Popish to the Protestant Religion, and married to Popish Wives, or Educating their children in the Popish Religion, from acting as Justice of the Peace* (7 George II, c. 6).

Penalty, one year's imprisonment without bail or mainprize and fine of £100, and incapable of being an executor, administrator, or guardian for ever.

- (22) 1740. *An Act to Explain, Amend, and Make more effectual an Act passed in the seventh year of the Reign of His late Majesty King William the Third of glorious memory, Intituled, An Act for the better securing the Government by Disarming Papists* (13 George II, c. 6).

Every Papist is to deliver up all Arms whatsoever in his custody or power, and it shall be lawful for the Authorities to search his house on suspicion of concealment under pain of a fine of £300.

A sword, a case of pistols, and a gun for defence of his house or for fowling allowed to any nobleman or gentleman giving proof that he has held a commission in his late Majesty's service and taken the oath of allegiance, &c.

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

By CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

IT was Count Cavour who in the last century invented the formula *chiesa libera in libero stato*¹ by which he hoped that the modern world would be able to solve the agelong problem of the relations of Church and State. In every country enormous difficulties of detail have been discovered in the drawing of an exact line of demarcation between the functions of the Church and those of the State. Yet the broad principles of Cavour's formula are clear enough. The Cavourian statesman finds in existence in his country the political machinery of the State, which it is his duty to use for the preservation of order; he finds also one or more organized religious bodies who recommend to their followers certain practices and methods of conduct as pleasing to God. It is no part of the duty of the statesman, as statesman, to inquire how these societies—the Church, or churches, and the State—came into being, nor which has the more ancient title-deeds. Still less is it his business to decide which, if any, of the religious bodies is correct in its professed interpretation of the Divine Will. His business is solely with the maintenance of order, and of religious beliefs and practices it is his duty to ask not whether or not they are true but whether or not they are a menace to the order of society. If they are a menace, then they may be suppressed, if they are not a menace, then, however fantastic he may in his private capacity think them to be, as a statesman it is his duty to tolerate them.

Such are the formulae of the liberal State, formulae, according to which all modern European States, with the exception of Russia, at least profess to conduct their policies. Yet, generally accepted though these formulae are to-day, there could be no greater mistake than to imagine that they have been generally accepted throughout Christian history. The task of the historian is to give without partiality the record of events and show, so far as he is able, how those events produced what is known as the modern mind. To attempt to interpret the past through the spectacles of the present—to pretend that our ancestors in any

¹ 'A free church in a free state.'

way shared our own peculiar interpretation of the proper relations between Church and State—to pretend that this or that individual or party, whether in the thirteenth or the sixteenth century, was the proponent of doctrines which would to-day be known as doctrines of religious toleration, whether the attempt be made from a Catholic, a Protestant, or from any other point of view, can merely succeed in confusing the reader.

The Christian Church, then, came to birth and grew up within the Roman Empire. At the time of her birth and for the first three hundred years of her existence, the question how far she should tolerate those who refused to accept her teaching naturally did not arise. The question was not whether she should tolerate but whether she would be tolerated, not whether she might persecute but how she ought to meet persecution. And her Founder, therefore, when laying upon her children the command to go out and 'teach all nations', while He gave charges as to how the faithful shall in the exercise of this task behave themselves towards properly constituted authority, never spoke to them explicitly of a time when the faithful should themselves be in a position of proper authority over the unfaithful. There were certain sayings of our Lord—in especial that in which He says 'Compel them to come in'—that in later controversy were to be quoted as justification of persecution. But there was in His recorded teaching no plain command to persecute.

With the reign of Constantine a new era in the Church's history began. By the Edict of Milan, in 313, Constantine announced that he and his fellow Emperor, Licinius, had decided to grant complete religious freedom to all Christians, and, indeed, to all men, whatever their religious professions. This edict was a reversal of the traditional imperial policy of insisting upon the supremacy of Caesar-worship and of the ancient Roman national religion. Constantine did not at once, it is true, make the Christian religion the religion of the Roman Empire. For a time he seems to have toyed with the notion that it would be possible to find some syncretistic formula through which he might annex to his support the Christian Church without quarrelling with the forces of the old paganism. But

his practical genius soon came to see the impossibility of such a syncresis and, understanding that he must choose between the one and the other, he definitely chose to rely upon Christian rather than upon pagan support and on his death-bed even himself accepted Christian baptism.

This is not the place to attempt an estimate of the mixture of motives which led Constantine to his decision. It is rather important to understand the bearing which that decision had on the question here under consideration. Up till this time there was, as we have said, no tradition of Christian persecution. The Christians, indeed, had had no opportunity of showing whether they would be tolerant or intolerant, and so little had they expected the conversion to Christianity of Caesar that Christian teachers had not at all given their minds to the consequences of such an enormous accident. Melito of Sardis had, it is true, as Eusebius tells us, speculated upon the possibility that Caesar might one day become a Christian,¹ but the more general view was that of Tertullian² and St Justin³ that a pagan Empire, containing within itself a small body of persecuted Christians, would continue until the end of the world. A Christian Caesar was thought to be an impossibility.

There was no tradition of Christian persecution. There was, on the other hand, a very large tradition of imperial persecution. Emperors had varied greatly from one another in the severity of persecution which they thought practically necessary. There had been no difference on what was thought to be the axiomatic proposition that Caesar had a right to punish those who refused to worship him. Did Constantine's Edict of Milan mean a complete abandonment of this tradition?

History can furnish few, if any, instances of this sudden and complete abandonment by a political unit of a traditional policy which its citizens have for generations accepted as plainly demanded by the necessities of nature. And the Caesars, when they accepted the Christian religion, did not at all abandon the principle that the Emperor had the right to decide to what extent he might allow his subjects to differ from himself.

¹ *Hist. Eccl.* iv. xxxiii.

² *Apol.* xxi.

³ i. xii

In the Middle Ages the Church, having convicted the heretic, used to hand him over to the secular arm for punishment. Yet the Church could only technically and formally escape the responsibility for such punishments. The conditions under the Roman Empire were entirely different. Very soon after Constantine we find examples of people being punished for refusing to adhere to the Christian religion. Yet there is abundant evidence that the Church had no kind of responsibility for that punishment. Persecution was entirely a political policy of the Caesars¹. Indeed, so little say had the Church in the policy of persecution that even after the Caesars had become Christians the Catholics suffered much more than they gained from the secular arm. At first, indeed, Constantine, who had himself no understanding of theological subtleties, accepted the voice of Nicaea as authoritative of Christian doctrine and, treating heresy as treason, banished Eusebius of Nicomedia and Arius who refused subscription to the full doctrine of consubstantiality. In 331, however, Constantine, thinking thus easily to resolve the weakening Christian discords, demanded that St. Athanasius should receive Arius back into communion, and, when the Saint refused, he was in his turn banished to Trier in 335, Arius received back, and the imperial patronage transferred to the heretics. It was from Eusebius, the Arian, that Constantine received baptism on his death-bed in 337.

Constantine's son and successor as Eastern Emperor, Constantius, continued his father's favour to the Arians. Constans in the West was Catholic, and through his influence St. Athanasius was restored to Alexandria. However, in 350, Constans died and Constantius was left supreme. A policy of the most vigorous persecution of Catholicism was taken up and met with apparently great success. Many of the Western bishops were induced to repudiate St. Athanasius, and to these years belongs the difficult story of Pope Liberius. The Saint himself was compelled to retire into the desert among the solitaries. 'Ingemuit totus orbis', writes St. Jerome, 'et Arianum se esse miratus est.'²

¹ Cf Maillet-Hanquet, *L'Église et la répression sanglante de l'hérésie*, Liège, 1909, p. 25. ² 'The whole world groaned and wondered to find itself Arian.'

After Constantius' death in 361 the Catholics exchanged the ill will of an Arian for that of a pagan Emperor, the famous Julian the Apostate. After him came Valens, the bitterest and most violent of all the persecuting Caesars. It was under his rule that SS Urbanus, Theodorus, and seventy-eight other Catholics who had come to Constantinople to plead for freedom of Catholic worship were put on to a boat which was set on fire when it reached the Bithynian coast and left to perish in mid-sea. It was not until the accession of Theodosius in 379, two generations after Constantine's vision before the Milvian Bridge, that the imperial policy was a Catholic policy or that that Christianity in whose name a policy of repression was carried through was Catholic Christianity.

The fathers, while in no way thinking that the Church had, or ought to have, any responsibility for repression of heresy, were yet on the whole willing to support the State in a policy of mild repression, wherever it seemed clearly necessary for the salvation of the social order. St. Augustine, for instance, had seen in Africa the Donatists, their thug-like allies, the Circumcellions, their rivals, the Maximianists. He understood that it was idle to talk of tolerating those who were not themselves willing to tolerate nor even to accept toleration, and therefore agreed to support the Emperor Honorius' policy of 'temperate severity', according to which the Donatists might be punished either by fine or by exile. At the end of his life in his letter *Ad Vincentium* and his *Retractaciones* he even laid it down that the State had a duty of suppression. St. John Chrysostom argued that the State had every right to prevent heretics from publicly propagating their heresy. St. Optatus of Milevi, alone, if we except Priscillian, argued that the State had the right to put heretics to death. 'Say you, the State cannot punish in the name of God. Yet was it not in the name of God that Moses and Phineas consigned to death the worshippers of the golden calf and those who despised the true religion?'¹ All the other fathers were at one in arguing that no lessons should be drawn from the example of the ancient Jews, for Jews lived under the old

¹ St. Optatus, *De schismate Donatistarum*, iii, cc 6-7.

dispensation, Christians under the new and merciful dispensation of Christ.

The doubtful privilege of being the first considerable Catholic persecutor in history must be given to the Emperor Theodosius, the law-maker of the united Roman Empire, who ruled in Constantinople from 379 to 395 and during the last year of his life over the Western Empire as well. Theodosius succeeded the Arian Valens, succeeded to an Empire in which the practice of Catholicism had been, as we have seen, most violently and bloodily proscribed. The temper of the times would never have admitted a policy of mere toleration, and therefore by the famous Edict of 380 the Emperors enacted that all their subjects should profess the faith of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria. The prefects were given orders to close all non-Catholic places of worship and to exile all heretics, schismatics, and pagans. Arians, Manichaeans, and heathens suffered at the hands of this imperial policy. Pagan sacrifices were forbidden, the Serapeum at Alexandria destroyed¹ On the other hand, Sozomen writes that Theodosius 'made severe punishments by his laws, but did not carry them out, for he did not wish to punish but only to frighten his subjects that they might think as he did about Divine things. And he praised those who were converted of their own accord.'²

In 385 there was seen the first instance of a formal condemnation to death and execution on the charge of heresy. The victim was the Spanish Manichaeian, Priscillian. He had been summoned to appear before the ecclesiastical Council of Bordeaux, but, refusing, had appealed instead to the imperial court—'a fatal mistake', as Sulpicius Severus says, 'which cost him his life'. A certain Bishop Ithacius was Priscillian's accuser. Ithacius was persuaded by his fellow bishops to withdraw the charge on the ground that a secular court could not be recognized by the Church as competent to deal with such a case. Yet the court persisted, condemned Priscillian for the crime of magic, and executed him.

¹ Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 16

² Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 12.

There was at once an outcry throughout Christendom not merely at the usurpation of the secular court but also at the very notion that heresy should be punished by death. Priscillian's, oddly enough, had been almost the solitary voice among early Christians which had called for the repression of heresy by the sword. 'To put a heretic to death', said St John Chrysostom, 'is an unpardonable crime.' 'No one ought to be forced into faith', said St. Augustine.¹ St. Ambrose protested from Milan. The saying of St. Athanasius was recalled that 'it is the business of religion not to compel but to persuade'.² St. Martin of Tours, who before the sentence had protested against a secular tribunal taking cognizance of an ecclesiastical case and had extracted from the Emperor a promise that blood would on no account be shed, refused to hold communion with any who had in any way been responsible for the crime. The Pope, St. Sixtus, protested, and excommunicated Bishop Felix of Trier, in whose diocese the execution had taken place and who had consented to it. Ithacius was compelled to resign his see.

Such was the imperial policy. Yet the Church authorities were in no way responsible for that policy. There is no evidence that they were consulted concerning it. On the other hand, St. Leo I, who in the next century ruled as Pope from 440 to 461, expressed his general approval of the Theodosian Code, arguing that, though the Church might not herself persecute heresy, she had in point of fact gained from its persecution by the civil power; and St. Ambrose, strongly disapproving of the execution of Priscillian, for which not Theodosius but Maximus, the Western Emperor, was responsible, was willing to be known as Theodosius' friend during his lifetime, his panegyrist after his death.

Throughout what are known as the Dark Ages the Caesars continued to rule at Constantinople, and within their dominions the question of toleration remained a question for the State rather than for the Church. In the Western world, on the other hand, the central political machinery collapsed. One inevitable result of this was an increase in the merely political importance both of the bishop of Rome and of other ecclesiastics throughout

¹ *Contra Ep. Petilianum*, II. lxxxiii.

² *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos*, lxvi.

Europe. For, once the Emperor was no more, the Pope remained as the sole relic of the old Roman order, the one rallying centre of the forces of Christendom and civilization against barbarism. It would not have been surprising had the Pope, in these new circumstances, argued that in the destruction of heresy and paganism lay the only hope of survival of the Roman things and claimed for himself those powers of repression which had previously been exercised by Caesar. Yet there is no record of any such claim and, scanty as our records are, it seems that there was surprisingly little in the way of persecution during the Dark Ages. The flogging and imprisonment of the monk Gothescalch in 849 for his denial that Christ died for all men was an example not of persecution but of penance imposed as a condition of reception back into a state of grace. The reason is perhaps that, with the decline of intellectual activity which a rougher age saw, there was during these years nothing in the way of organized heresy within the Christian body, while the pagan was now the Christian's open enemy to be fought upon the field of battle, not to be tried in the court of law.

Of the kingdoms which rose on the ruins of the Western Empire by far the most important, and those with whose history we are by far the best acquainted, were those of the Franks. From the conversion of Clovis to Catholicism, in 496, onwards, the Merovingian kings of these kingdoms were themselves Christian. Yet they did not attempt, as the Roman Emperors before them had attempted, to ensure the religious uniformity of their subjects. The times were as empty of religious persecution as they were full of general savagery.

The only exception to the generalization of Merovingian tolerance is the oath which Clovis took after his conversion to free Gaul of heretics—by which he meant to destroy the Arian Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse. This oath brought little good to the Catholic cause. Up till this time the Arian kings had behaved with tolerance towards Catholic subjects. Under Euric, who reigned from 466 to 484, a few Catholic bishops and priests had been punished—but only, it seems, for political disaffection. Otherwise there had been no interference with Catholic freedom.

Yet, in spite of this, the Catholic clergy sided with the invading Franks. Not unnaturally, therefore, Alaric II took severe measures against them.

He was, however, defeated and killed by Clovis and the Visigothic kingdom driven across the Pyrenees to Toledo. Then once more a policy of toleration was pursued, such repressive laws as were passed being only against plain enemies of organized society, such as Manichaeans and Montanists, or alternatively against those who, like the Eunomeans, sought to out-Arius Arius. Under these conditions Catholicism gained ground at the expense of Arianism until in the reign of Reccared (586-601) king and kingdom alike became Catholic. After further troubles the kingdom fell before the invading Arabs in 711.

The Carolingian State had a much more definitely religious basis than the Merovingian, and with Charlemagne there enters into history a new sort of authority. The old Roman Empire traced back its title-deeds to a time before the Christian era. The Frankish and Visigothic kings exercised their rule in brutal and dismal days, when men were too glad to accept any refuge from anarchy for them to inquire very closely into the sources from which authority derived itself. With Charlemagne there came a new State. Charlemagne was Emperor because the Pope had recognized him as such. His authority was a Catholic authority in a sense in which no temporal authority had ever been before, and from such a State it was only natural to expect a new policy towards the obstinate opponent of Christianity. On the one hand, Charlemagne interfered vigorously in the Adoptionist controversy and, while condemning the heresy, refused to permit any methods of repression to be used against it. For a time, too, he threatened to take the iconoclastic side on the question of image-worship. The normal penal code of Charlemagne was a humane one. The death penalty was forbidden '*grâce à l'influence de l'église, ce qui montre combien celle-ci gardait vivace, en entrant dans le moyen âge, ce sentiment de clémence que nous avons constaté chez elle dans l'antiquité chrétienne*'.¹ On the other hand, in his wars against the

¹ 'Thanks to the influence of Church, which shows how strong she kept, at the

Saxons he deliberately adopted the policy that the heathens must be offered the alternatives of baptism or death—a policy which found formal statement in the Saxon Capitulary of 781. From the memory of the vigorous rhetoric of Disraeli, readers are probably familiar with the vigour with which this policy was put into execution. Yet the ecclesiastical authorities gave no more sanction to it than they had usually done to the repressive policies of Roman Emperors. On the contrary, Alcuin protested against it to Charlemagne, writing

Faith is a matter of will, not of necessity. How can you force a man to believe what he does not believe? One can force baptism on people, but not faith. Man, an intelligent being, reasons, disposition, and desire for truth ought to bring him to recognize the truth of our holy faith. And prayer, above all, ought to bring down upon him the mercy of Almighty God, for argument echoes in vain, if the dew of grace does not wet the heart of the hearer.¹

With the turn of the millennium Christendom found itself faced with a new problem. The return of stabler times naturally brought increased opportunity for intellectual speculation, and it was, of course, on the one hand, out of this opportunity that there arose the glories of medieval scholasticism. But, as was only to be expected, a growth of interest in intellectual things brought an increase not only in orthodox but also in heretical speculation. Soon after the beginning of the millennium we find traces in various parts of Europe of a new and strange sect, immigrant, as it seems, from eastern Europe, where it long flourished and where it had been vigorously persecuted by the Eastern Emperors, called the Cathari. *καθαρός* is the Greek word for ‘pure’, and the Cathari, or ‘pure’, held a theology and a metaphysic not unlike that of the Manichaeans. Thus they were dualists. There were in the world, they believed, two principles—that of spirit, which was good; that of matter, which was evil. Obvious necessary consequences of the belief in the inherent evil of matter were (1) the abandonment of a belief that matter was divinely created, hence the abandonment of a beginning of the Middle Ages, that instinct for clemency which we have already noted in her in Christian antiquity’—Maillet-Hanquet, *L'Église et la répression sanglante de l'hérésie*, Liège, 1909, p 28

¹ Alcuin, Ep XXXVI

belief in a creating and Omnipotent God, (2) a rejection of the Incarnation, as it was ordinarily held by Christians. Christ, according to them, did not become flesh. He only appeared to become flesh. He only appeared to be born of Mary. He only appeared to suffer. They did not, however, copy the Oriental mythology of the Manichaeans, their belief in the two spirits, of good and of evil, which were wrestling for the world.

The ethical consequences which they deduced from their theology were more plainly a menace to ordered society than was the theology itself. Their refusal to take any form of oath,¹ need not in itself have led to their persecution any more than such a refusal has necessitated persecution of Quakers in our own time. But in the circumstances of the eleventh century their doctrine of complete non-resistance, which forbade the citizen to defend the State in war² or the State to shed the blood of the citizen in punishment,³ would, had it triumphed, have very clearly delivered over Europe to Mahomedan and barbarian invaders. 'Praedicatores Crucis sunt omnes homicidae',⁴ was their verdict,⁵ and indeed some of the extreme Catharists denied to the State any right to punish at all.

More strange still was their teaching upon sexual matters. Sex, since it was physical, was therefore bad, and the procreation of children was doubly bad. It was best to refrain altogether from all sexual activity, and to this the stronger souls, or *perfecti*, dedicated themselves. The weaker brethren, or mere *credentes*, finding themselves incapable of such continence, made a *convenenza*, or promise, that they would take the *consolamentum*, or oath of initiation, on their death-bed. In the meantime sexual activity was not forbidden to them, but, in direct opposition to Christian teaching, the *credens* should make it his business to see that his activity did not result in the birth of children. Procreation was a sin, and a woman who died with

¹ *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden*, anno 1170 (Rolls Series, II, pp. 105-17), *Documents pour servir pour l'Historie de l'Inquisition* (ed. Covais, Paris, 1886), pp. 90-114.

² *Documents, &c* (Douai), Dollinger, *Beitrage*, II 199

³ *Ibid.*, *Liber Sententiarum Inquisitorum Tolosanae* (Amsterdam, 1692), p. 207

⁴ 'The champions of the Cross are all murderers.'

⁵ Doat, xcii, p. 89.

child could not possibly be saved¹ The Catharists are said to have originated in Bulgaria, and etymology bears sufficient witness to the manner in which the *credentes* were at least popularly supposed to have solved their moral problems. So evil a thing was life that not only was procreation severely condemned but suicide was warmly praised and encouraged. Though it was forbidden to take life in war or as a punishment, yet it was meritorious for a mother, having committed the cardinal error of bearing a child, to atone for it by starving that child to death²

It is idle to argue, as is sometimes argued, that it is only the malice of enemies which has ascribed to the Cathari such strange doctrines. The evidence of their beliefs can be culled not from the accusations of their enemies, but from their own confessions. And there is ample evidence that wherever they got the chance—in the Midi under Pierre de Bruys and Henri, in Italy under Arnold of Brescia, in Auvergne, in Languedoc under Raymond Roger—they thought it their duty utterly to destroy every evidence of Catholic life and to murder those on whom they could lay their hands³ ‘Civibus bellis ecclesiam inquietare non cessant’,⁴ writes of them the not excessively orthodox Abelard.⁵ Lea, the historian of the Inquisition, assuredly no biased partisan of orthodox Christianity, has the fairness to bear witness that ‘however much we may deprecate the means used for its [Catharism’s] suppression and commiserate those who suffered for conscience’ sake, we cannot but admit that the cause of orthodoxy was in this case the cause of progress and civilization. Had Catharism become dominant, or even had it been allowed to exist on equal terms, its influence could not have failed to become disastrous.⁶

Catharism differed from previous heresies not only in the strangeness of its doctrines. It differed, too, because the Cathari

¹ *Documents, &c.* (Douais), *Laber, &c.*, pp 92, 178 Bonacurius, *Vita Hereticorum*, cap v, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, tome 204, cols 780–1

² *Liber Sententiarum*, Tanon, *Histoire des Tribunaux de l’Inquisition en France*, p 224, E Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, pp 70–2

³ *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi catholique*, ‘Inquisition’, pp 843–5

⁴ ‘They never ceased to disturb the Church with their civil wars’

⁵ *Intro. ad theologiam*, ed. Cousin, ii. 83.

⁶ Lea, *Inquisition*, i 106.

appeared not as isolated individuals putting forward their opinions They appeared as an organized society, with their own definite constitution and making no concealment of their purpose, if possible, to overthrow the Church, which they looked upon as a blasphemy, and to capture control of the machinery of the State. It is clear that, if it be the business of the prince to preserve his State from destruction, it was perfectly impossible for him to have remained indifferent to this strange menace.

On this point there was little difference of opinion among the princes of Europe The first recorded appearances of these Cathari are at Vertus in the diocese of Châlons in 1009 and at Toulouse in 1018 In 1022, thirteen, of whom ten were canons of the Church of the Holy Cross and one had been confessor to Queen Constance, were discovered at Orleans. They were charged not before an ecclesiastical tribunal, but before the council of King Robert the Pious, 'quoniam et ruinam patriae revera et animarum metuebat interitum'.¹ There were at the time no regular 'heresy laws' by which they could be judged, yet by the unanimous vote of the council they were condemned to be burned The people themselves tried to lay hands on them and to execute the sentence in the Church of La Croix. They were with difficulty prevented.² The sentence was executed outside the city walls.

This is the first recorded instance in European history of the burning of heretics. As to the actual punishment of burning it is sufficient to say with M Julien Havet

In the early Middle Ages the penalty of the stake was an ordinary method of inflicting capital punishment, perhaps even the most ordinary after hanging . Burning, moreover, was the ordinary punishment for poisoners, sorcerers and witches, and it might have seemed obvious to liken heresy to witchcraft or poisoning. Finally, the stake, more destructive than the gallows, more cruel, more theatrical, might have appeared more likely to waken a salutary terror in the hearts of the condemned, who had the choice either of abjuration or of punishment³

¹ 'Because he truly feared both the ruin of his country and the loss of souls'—Raoul, *Glaber*, iii 8

² *Ibid.*

³ 'L'hérésie et le bras séculier en Moyen Âge', *Cévennes*, ii, pp 130-1

There was doubtless something in the reasoning which Guillaume le Breton ascribes to Philip Augustus, who burnt, says the chronicler, 'so that the material fire might be a foretaste to them of the flames of hell'¹

In 1025 some more Cathari were charged at Liége and Arras, but on recantation they were left unmolested. In 1045 we have a letter from Bishop Roger II of Châlons to Bishop Wazo of Liége asking for advice on the best method of treating them. Wazo advised leniency. He wrote

God does not wish the death of the sinner, but his conversion. Has not Christ given us the example of meekness towards heretics when He, Almighty though He was, bore the insults, the injuries, the cruelties of the Jews, and at the end the punishment of the Cross? And, when in the parable, He advised us to let the tares grow with the good grain until the harvest, did He not mean that the good ought to live along with the bad until the Judgement of God which alone shall separate them? . Those whom the world to-day considers as tares may be, when the harvest comes, gathered in by God with the good corn. Those whom we look on as the enemies of God may be set by Him above us in Heaven.²

The Councils of Rheims in 1049 and of Toulouse in 1056 deliberated on the menace of Catharism and agreed that the Church should use the full rigour of spiritual weapons—the major excommunication—for its suppression. Later Pope Alexander II wrote to the archbishop of Narbonne to remind him 'quod leges tam ecclesiasticæ quam seculares effusionem humani sanguinis prohibent'.³ Writing to Béranger, the Viscount of Narbonne, to urge him to undertake the defence of the Jews, the same Pope laid down the general proposition 'We must not put them to death for God does not take pleasure in the shedding of blood nor rejoice at the destruction of the wicked.'⁴

In 1077 a self-confessed heretic was burnt by the mob at

¹ Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, xvii, p. 127

² *Gesta Episcoporum Leodiensium*, ap. Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historiae, Scriptores*, VII. 27

³ 'Because the laws both ecclesiastical and secular forbid the shedding of human blood.'

⁴ Mansi, XIX. 980

Cambrai¹ In 1134 several Cathari captured in the diocese of Soissons were seized, while their case was being tried by the Council there, and burnt by the *fidelis populus* of Beauvais, *clericalem verens mollitatem*, 'fearing the softness of the clergy', to quote Guibert de Nogent² In 1144 the mob of Liége tried to wreak a similar vengeance; many, if not all, of the accused were Cathari and were saved by the Bishop, Adalbert II.³

In 1145–6 St. Bernard conducted a missionary tour through southern France for the conversion of the Catharists. *Capiantur non armis sed argumentis*,⁴ 'Let them be conquered by arguments rather than by arms', was the motto that he gave to himself. Force was to be employed against heretics only when they themselves had first attacked the Catholics⁵ As for the mobs who had done violence to Catharists, he wrote 'I approve the zeal, but I do not advise imitation of the deed, for it is necessary to bring men to the faith by persuasion and not by force.' St. Hildegarde also wrote 'Drive heretics out of the Church, but do not kill them, for they, like us, are made in the image of God'⁶ 'Catharists, even though divinely convicted in an ordeal, must not be punished by death', taught Peter Canter

In 1163 there was a controversy about the treatment of a further nest of them in Flanders, between the Pope, Alexander III, who advocated leniency, and the King, Louis VII, who was for vigorous repression. 'Mercy sits better on Churchmen than severity',⁷ wrote the Pope In 1167 seven Cathari were charged at Vézelay in Burgundy The abbot was the temporal prince of the town, and he appealed to his subjects for their verdict on the heretics 'Burn them', shouted the mob, and the abbot weakly let them have their way.⁸

The harsher policy was beginning to appear The Lateran

¹ Fredericq, *Corpus Documentorum Inquisitionis Hereticae Primitatis Nederlandiae*, I, p. 13

² Bouquet, op. cit., vii 266 Venerabilis Guiberti Abbatis, *De Vita Sua*, iii 16, *Opera Omnia*, Paris, 1651, p. 520

³ Fredericq, op. cit., I, p. 321

⁴ *In Cantic*, Sermo LXIV.

⁵ Vacandard, *St. Bernard*, ii, p. 213

⁶ Schmidt, *Histoire des Doctrines de la Secte des Cathares*, i, p. 219.

⁷ Maiténe, *Amplissima Collectio*, ii 683

⁸ Lea, *History of the Inquisition*, i 350

Council of 1139 for the first time said of heretics: 'We condemn them and we order the civil power to repress them.'¹ In accordance with this decree Innocent II ordered the arrest of Abelard and Arnold of Brescia—orders which were only very mildly obeyed²—and this new policy of the Church was reiterated by the Council of Rheims in 1148³ and the Council of Tours in 1163. 'Catharism', repeated this latter Council, 'has spread like a cancer across all Gascony and into other provinces'.⁴ The cancer must be cut out.

For the first time the Church was beginning to call on the prince to repress, beginning to advocate what previously she had only permitted. We find at the end of the century the archbishop of Rheims, Guillaume de Champagne, vigorously cooperating with the count of Flanders, Philip I, in his repressive measures, and Hugues, bishop of Auxerre, indulging in similar repression in his own diocese. As a result, by the end of the twelfth century, Catharism had been almost confined to one particular diocese of southern France, where it flourished under the name of Albigensianism.

Religious persecution, that is to say, the infliction of temporal punishment by officials of the Church, appeared in Italy at an earlier date than in France. Between 1030 and 1040 a Catharist community was discovered at Monteforte in Piedmont and its members burnt by order of the bishop of Asti. On the other hand, some who not only refused to recant, but insisted on proselytizing, were offered the alternatives of the stake or the Cross by the magistrates of Milan, of whom *maiores laici*, 'the greater part were laymen'⁵. Here the Archbishop Heribert attempted to save their lives, but ineffectually. The obstinate were burnt. Throughout the twelfth century there were sporadic outbursts of Catharism, especially at Orvieto and Milan. The attempt at repression was made and the Cathari at times replied, as in the case of St. Peter Panuzo in 1199, with assassination of Catholics, strongly though their principles, one

¹ Mansi, XXI, p. 532

² Ibid., p. 565

³ Ibid., p. 718

⁴ Ibid., p. 1178

⁵ Landulphus, quoted by Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, iv, p. 89

would have thought, should have condemned such a crime. The earliest definite enactment of a regular penalty of death for heresy comes in the Lombard Law of 1228 of the anti-clerical Emperor, Frederick II, followed by his Sicilian Constitutions of 1231.

In Germany the first Cathari are found at Goslar in Hanover in 1052. They were hanged by order of the Emperor, Henry III, *consensu cunctorum*, 'by general agreement', to quote the old chronicler, Hermannus Contractus, though the author of the *Gesta Episcoporum Leodiensium*, writing later, condemns the executions hotly, saying: 'Such condemnations are not in accordance with the law of God.'¹ In 1143 a Catharist bishop and his *socius* were put on trial at Cologne. The mob, as at Beauvais thirty years before, broke in, seized the accused and burnt them.² In 1163 there was another execution at Cologne and one also at Bonn.

In 1159 thirty German Cathari landed in England and set out on a mission of proselytism. They were arrested in 1166, and Henry II, in a council at Oxford, ordered that they should be branded with hot irons and turned loose. Any one who sheltered them or gave them food would have his house razed to the ground. The poor wretches all perished from hunger or exposure. Later in the same year the Assizes of Clarendon, in which Henry challenged the Church's claim to autonomy, yet ratified his exclusively civil decree.³

The Church did not enter upon the great experiment of medieval civilization with any predetermination to persecute. The strange, yet dangerous, menace of Catharism had presented her with an entirely unforeseen situation. It was idle to talk of merely tolerating Catharism as if it were some harmless difference of opinion, nor, if she were the spiritual mother of her children and if princes were among her sons, could she evade responsibility by merely saying that the preservation of society was the prince's business. Might the prince in Catholic morals

¹ Bouquet, op. cit., xi, p. 200.

² Letter of Ehevini to St Bernard, cap. 11, in Migne, P. L., tome clxxxii, col. 677.

³ Assizes of Clarendon, Statute 21.

repress heretical opinions where such repression seemed necessary for the preservation of society?

The answer of the Church throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries was in sum 'Be as lenient as possible, but in the last resort you may use such measures' By the beginning of the thirteenth century it is fair to say that she was quite definitely coming to the conclusion that against the Cathari such measures were necessary. At the Council of Tours she, for the first time, demanded what previously she had at the most been only willing to tolerate.

Right through the Middle Ages Catharism survived underground, cropping up now here, now there. As late as the fifteenth century St. Vincent Ferrer found it still in existence in Lombardy. Yet substantially the repressions of the eleventh and twelfth centuries succeeded in their immediate objects. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, Catharism only survived in strength among the Albigensians of southern France.

In 1177 Count Raymond V of Toulouse wrote to the chapter-general of Cîteaux to describe the pitiable condition of his State under the influence of Catharism. Family life was perishing, all was falling into anarchy. He admitted himself incapable of controlling affairs 'As the spiritual sword is absolutely impotent, it is necessary to employ the temporal, and that is why I insist that the King of France should promise to come to these places'¹ The Cardinal-Legate Peter was sent to see if he could put matters to rights, but on his admission of failure the General Council of the Lateran in 1179 called on other Christian princes to impose upon the people the will of their Prince Raymond and to suppress Albigensianism by force²

In 1184 the Council of Verona, presided over by the new Pope, Lucius III, promulgated a definite constitution against the heretics. Not only were they to be excommunicated, but they were also to be handed over to the secular arm for punishment, and further penalties, spiritual, such as excommunication, and temporal, such as forfeiture, were decreed against princes and magistrates who neglected to do their duty of punishment. Not

¹ *Histoire de Languedoc*, vi, p. 78

² *Decret*, Greg., ix v, vii

only were the ecclesiastical authorities to take cognizance of heretics who advertised themselves. For the first time they were bidden to search them out. As yet, however, there was no mention of the death penalty.

In 1194 the situation was made worse by the death of Raymond V and the succession to him of Raymond VI, who was a favourite of the heretics and who let them loose on the Catholics.¹ Innocent III, who succeeded to the Papal throne in 1198, made the momentously new decision that it was the duty of the faithful to suppress the heresy even against the wishes of the secular ruler. Raymond, in a panic, in order to keep his throne, promised amendment to the Pope and the expulsion of the heretics from his dominions, while St. Dominic was beginning the great missionary work by which he hoped that heresy might yet be conquered with the weapons of the spirit. Yet such weapons were not found sufficient, while Raymond either could not, or would not, fulfil his promises. And Pope Innocent III, finding that the heresy, far from being suppressed, had spread till it embraced a thousand cities or towns, in 1207 solemnly called on the King of France, the suzerain of Toulouse, to suppress it by force. When in the next year his legate, Peter of Castelnau, was assassinated, Innocent repeated his command.

The King obeyed. A crusading army of Germans and northern Frenchmen was raised and put under the leadership of Arnold, abbot of Cîteaux, and two bishops. Raymond, in fear, submitted to the Pope and joined the Crusade against his subjects. In 1209 the army marched down and captured the two heretical strongholds of Béziers and Carcassonne. There is no evidence that at the capture of Béziers the Papal legate gave the command. 'Slay all, the Lord will know His own.'²

Disputes soon broke out between Raymond and Simon de Montfort the elder, who had been appointed military leader of the Crusade. Eventually Raymond was a third time excommunicated for not fulfilling the conditions of his reconciliation, and in 1211 Innocent declared his country forfeit to whoever

¹ Lea, op. cit., p. 141.

² Tannizey de Larroque, *Revue des Questions historiques*, 1866, 1, pp. 168-91.

should take possession of it. Simon accepted the invitation and in the resulting war the crusaders perpetrated a terrible massacre at Lavaur in 1211 and finally overthrew their enemies at Muret in 1213.

It is idle to pretend that Simon's motives, however pure at the first, continued so throughout the war, and Innocent tried to control the ambitious adventurer. Unable to do so, and informed that only by the recognition of Simon's rights was there a possibility of crushing heresy, he agreed to such a recognition in 1215. Simon died in 1218 and was succeeded by his son, Almaric. The political problem was eventually solved by the cession of their rights by both Almaric and Raymond to the King of France. In order to guard the purity of the faith for the future the Council of Toulouse in 1229 established a Court of Inquisition for the suppression of heresy based on the constitution promulgated by the Council of Verona in 1184. In 1233 this court was entrusted to the Dominicans.

It is important to note how far this Albigensian crisis caused the enunciation by the Church of new principles and claims.

The Church had never denied that the prince had the right and the duty to preserve society. It was no sin in him to enforce the ordinary law and it was admitted that extraordinary cases required extraordinary remedies. There was at the time no dispute, and there is to-day little serious dispute, that Catharism was a very dangerous menace to society. If it had not been so, why should men as little religious as the Emperor Frederick II or Henry II of England, both excommunicates, have taken measures against it? As even this essay will show, the picture of Albigensian society painted by Macaulay in his essay on Ranke's *History of the Popes* is the sheerest fairy-tale, bearing no kind of relation to the truth at any point whatsoever. It would not have been disputed that Raymond V had acted commendably and within his rights had he suppressed the Albigensians of his dominions. But when the secular ruler wished to suppress heresy and was not able to do so, had the Church the right to call on other secular rulers to help him? Raymond's death prevented a clear answer.

Instead, a second question was raised by Raymond VI's apostasy. When the government of a State passes from Catholic to heretic hands, has the Church the right to call on other secular rulers to restore it to Catholicism? Innocent III considered that at any rate the Church had the right to call on the apostate's suzerain to restore Catholicism. It is hard to think that any one who at all understands the nature of the Church's or the Pope's claims will find Innocent's answer to those two questions at all extravagant. His third answer was much more questionable.

After Raymond's failure to fulfil the conditions of reconciliation, the question arose Has the Church, after deposing an apostate, the right to settle who shall be his successor? Innocent's method of settling—his announcement that whoever could take Raymond's power might keep it—was a singularly unfortunate one and an invitation to war. But the presumption of answering such a question in the affirmative at all was a novelty. It was one thing to concede to the Church, the guardian of morals, a right of veto—a right to say that the faithful were under no obligation to obey a particular law that was contrary to the moral law and, in extreme cases, were under no obligation to obey a prince whose policy was in contradiction with the moral law. It was another matter to claim to say what prince should take the place of him whom she had deposed. When, in 751, Pepin had asked Pope Zachary to give a ruling on the lawfulness of his assumption of the crown, Zachary had replied: 'Ut melius esset illum regem vocari qui potestatem haberet quam illum qui sine regali potestate maneret.'¹ Or, in other words, in doubtful cases, the Church recognized *de facto* governments. Her own kingdom was not of this world, and it was not for her, under normal circumstances, to take sides in the disputes of nations about their secular rulers. They must settle those disputes for themselves. Innocent had asserted a new principle.

Yet the first importance of the Albigensian episode is that it saddled Christendom with the Inquisition. The condition on

¹ "That it was better that he who actually had the power should be called king rather than he who had it not."

which Raymond VI was allowed to keep a portion of his territory was that he would punish 'secundum ordinem quem super hoc faciet dominus legatus'¹ all who had been declared heretics 'per episcopum vel alium qui potestatem habeat'.² Raymond was made to take an oath of obedience to these conditions.

The bishops and archbishops for their part were charged to search for heretics in all houses, and even all caves, 'domos singulas et cavernas subterraneas seu quaecumque alia latibula',³ and hand them over to the prince. All condemned heretics and all suspects—by which was meant people who were not willing to prove their orthodoxy by confessing and communicating at least three times a year—were to be forbidden for ever from holding any public post. By an ordinance of Innocent III of 1199 it had already been decided that they should forfeit all property, even if their children were Catholic. Yet there was still no question of the death penalty. The cause of justice can hardly have been assisted by a Bull of 1205, *Si adversus vos*, according to which all lawyers who favoured heretics or offered to them their professional services were declared infamous and suspended from their functions.

In 1232–4 the Inquisition was allowed to spread from Toulouse to the rest of France. In 1232 it was established in Aragon, in 1255 in Castile. In 1224 it was established at Brescia, in 1232 in Milan, in 1230 in Florence, in 1231 in Rome. In 1231 it was established in Germany; thence it spread to Bohemia, Hungary, the Netherlands, and even, for short periods, into the Slavonic and Scandinavian countries. The British Isles, alone of the countries of Christendom, did not possess it.

The Inquisition marked, if not quite the first assertion, at least the first definite acceptance by the Church of certain new principles. For eleven hundred years she had taught almost without wavering that heresy as such was not to be punished, that princes had the duty to preserve the order of society, that a heretic might also be an enemy to ordered society and that, if

¹ 'According to the regulations which the lord legate may make on this point'

² 'By the bishop or some other who has authority to do so'—Mansi, *Concilia*, xxiii, p. 163

³ 'Isolated houses, underground caves, or any other hiding-places'

he could be proved to be so, the prince had the right to punish him. The Church had not considered that it was her task to preserve society. Her task was to witness to the eternal truths, and, whether she bore that witness in a world of order or in a world of anarchy, was to her a matter of indifference. If it should be God's providential plan to reduce the world to anarchy through heresy, to place foolish Ishbosheths upon imperial thrones, it was not for the Church to interfere.

Such were the principles of eleven hundred years. In the twelfth century the Church doubted, in the thirteenth she came out definitely in favour of the new policy—the policy of co-operating with and urging what she had previously only permitted. It is certainly true that it was the Church of the thirteenth century—the persecuting Church—which was responsible for preserving society and for bringing to Christendom the glories of medieval culture. But to the Christian of the Roman Empire or of the Dark Ages such a claim would perhaps have seemed irrelevant. He might have asked whether the Church had any business to preserve society. Our Lord, omnipotent as He was, could have compelled people to accept Him. He refused to do so, He refused even to use force in order to preserve people from apostasy, and the mind of the Church for eleven hundred years was quite unanimous that without express authority from Him the Church had no right to claim for herself this awful power which He had Himself refused to exercise. 'It is the business of religion', as we have already quoted from St Athanasius, 'not to compel but to persuade'¹. Doubtless the loss of faith was a terrible thing, but it was absurd to suppose that men could be wiser than God Who saw all. If God wished the wiles of the heresiarch to be brought to nothing, it was within His power to give to the heresiarch's hearers sufficient grace to withstand his arguments. If He permitted the heresiarch apparently to prosper, it was absurd to imagine that He would be mocked at the Day of Judgement and would not be able to compute the blame of this and that soul with a justice that made it merely blasphemous for man to attempt to forestall

¹ *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos*, lxvii

His judgements. As Alcuin asked, 'How can you force a man to believe what he does not believe? One can force baptism on people, but not faith '¹

It is arguable that in Toulouse secular authority had broken down and that, unpleasant as the new policy of hunting for heresy was, it was an unpleasant necessity. Experience had proved that it was not safe to wait for the insanities of Catharism to declare themselves. The situation was wholly abnormal and the Church perhaps justified in taking upon herself functions which she usually left to the prince. But such an argument could not justify the extension of the Inquisition to other countries where the secular machinery had certainly proved itself tolerably competent for its own work. Still less could it justify the establishment of a permanent Inquisition, which was not to disappear, as it should have disappeared, with the passing of the particular crisis, but to survive long after Catharism had ceased to menace society. It is sometimes argued, and truly, that a regular Inquisition controlled and moderated the violence of the secular princes. But would it not have been possible for the Church to have exercised such a moderating influence without establishing an Inquisition of her own?

Granting, however, that, rightly or wrongly, the Church did become a persecuting Church in the thirteenth century, we have next to consider whether or not she executed the justice which she professed to execute—whether adequate means were taken to make sure that those who were punished for heresy were really guilty of heresy.

We have ample record of the procedure of the Inquisition. As soon as the Inquisitor arrived in a particular town where he purposed to hold his court, he issued two edicts—an edict of faith and an edict of grace. The edict of faith called on all the faithful to delate to him any of their fellow citizens whom they suspected of heresy. The edict of grace fixed a period—from 15 to 30 days—within which any heretic who came, confessed, and abjured, might receive pardon on submission to the canonical penance.² After the period of grace had elapsed, any persons

¹ Alcuin, Ep XXXVI.

² Eymeric, *Directorium*, 3rd part, nn. 52, 53–6.

who had been denounced under the edict of faith and had not availed themselves of the edict of grace were seized and brought to trial. The defendant then had the right to show, if he was able, that his accusers were personal enemies.¹ But, as it was very rarely that he was allowed to know who his accusers were, this privilege was of small value. As we have already shown, by the Bull of Innocent III, *Si adversus vos*, legal aid was blocked.

The defendant might then, if he wished, either deny the charge or plead guilty and abjure his heresy. In the latter case, the Inquisitor became his confessor, and imposed on him a penance. The penance for a repentant heretic was

They shall wear crosses (sewed on to their clothes), present themselves every Sunday between the Epistle and the Gospel before the priest with a rod and receive the discipline. They shall do the same at all solemn processions. The first Sunday of the month, after the procession or the Mass, they shall visit in penitential garb the houses of the town or village which knew them in their heretical days. They shall assist, every Sunday, at Mass, at Vespers, and at sermons, and shall make pilgrimages.²

If the defendant refused to confess and abjure, it then became the duty of the Inquisitor to induce him to do so. The Inquisitor David of Augsburg indicates the four main methods of inducement—the fear of death, prison on short rations, a visit from picked priests to argue with him, and torture.³

The trial was conducted in secret. The sentence, on the other hand, was given in public and with great solemnity. Various sentences were passed on the guilty in accordance with the heinousness of their crime, but roughly the sentences fell into three classes. The lightest were those of a fine; above that came imprisonment, either *murus strictus* or *murus largus*. 'The condemned to the *murus strictus* was cast, with his feet chained, into a narrow and dark cell; sometimes he was chained to the wall.'⁴ This punishment was reserved for those who, in addition to their heresy, were also guilty of perjury. Those who were

¹ Eymeric, op cit., n. 67

³ Mgr. Douais, *L'Inquisition*, p. 170

² Labbe, *Concilium*, xi. 488.

⁴ Lea, op cit., i, p. 486

condemned to *murus langus* could sometimes take a little exercise in the corridors. Imprisonment might be either for a time or for life.

For the worst offenders there was the stake 'Ecclesia abhoret a sanguine',¹ and the guilty were therefore handed over to the secular arm to receive the 'animadversio debita'² of death. The definite acceptance by the Church of death as the *animadversio debita* dates from the ecclesiastical criminal law of 1251. It is, of course, idle to produce the pure formality of handing over to the secular arm as a serious argument against the real responsibility of the Church, right or wrong, for the shedding of blood. For the Church did not hand over the victim to the secular arm to inflict upon him whatever punishment it saw fit. On the contrary, it used every weapon of which it was capable to make sure that the secular arm should shed the blood from which the Church herself shrank. The secular arm, Eymeric tells us in his *Directorium*, 'must receive them (the condemned) at once, and, in five days or less, execute on them the sentences which have been passed'. The severest ecclesiastical penalties fell upon a secular ruler who refused to execute a sentence. The necessity to quibble proves that there was a feeling that the Church ought not to have taken upon herself such a responsibility, it does not alter the fact that she did take it.

Inquisitors were human beings who differed from one another, as human beings will, in the impartiality of their justice, in the quality of their mercy. Rhetorical generalizations, whether of praise or of abhorrence, are of little value. There were inquisitors who carried out their awful task with God ever before their eyes, to whom the great law was the law of charity and the mastering passion the desire to save the soul of the poor wretch before them. It is folly to imagine that there must have been hatred because there was severity. There were others who were corrupted by power, just as there have been many corrupted by every sort of power since time began.

Yet the Church, to do her justice, from the first was aware of the great danger of allowing inquisitorial power to fall into any

¹ 'The Church shrinks from bloodshed'

² 'Regular penalty'

casual hands. Pope after Pope issued orders that the strictest qualifications be insisted on, and M. de Cauzons, an enemy of the Inquisition, admits of inquisitors that they were 'généralement des hommes remarquables'.¹ A Robert le Bougre was a rarity, and the Church showed that she had no wish to encourage his imitators by condemning him to incarceration for life. No mistake could be greater than to imagine that inquisitors were irresponsible. On the contrary, they were held most strictly to account and any miscarriage of justice was visited with punishments only less terrific than those which they themselves meted out. Clement V condemned to an excommunication, only relievable in the article of death, an inquisitor who had used his position for purposes of peculation.² Every official was under the strictest orders to report any abuse of power by an inquisition, and such were the precautions that were very soon erected against such abuses that M. de Cauzons gives it as his opinion that by the fourteenth century the Inquisition was 'une des machines judiciaires les mieux organisées qui fussent'.³

It is far from true, as is sometimes said, that no one was free from the clutches of the Inquisition. To begin with, it was concerned only with the purity of the Christian faith. Jews did not come under its jurisdiction. (We speak for the moment only of the medieval Inquisition, the later Spanish Inquisition will be discussed in its proper place.) According to medieval teaching, as embodied, for instance, in St Thomas, there was a definite Christian duty to tolerate Judaism. Jews, says St. Thomas, 'merit tolerance' because, to quote Eymeric's *Directorium*, Christians find in their faith a 'testimonium fiduci Christianae'.⁴ There is only one instance of the Inquisition's interfering with this general principle of toleration of Jews. That was the burning of the books of the Talmud. The Talmud was taught in all Jewish schools. Among its precepts could be found such sentences as 'One can and one should kill the best of *Goyim* (Gentiles).

¹ *Histoire de l'Inquisition*, II, p. 61.

² Clementin, v. iii. 2.

³ 'One of the best organized judicial machines that ever existed.'

⁴ 'An evidence of the truth of the Christian faith.'

A *Goy* (Gentile) who rests on Saturday deserves death. A *Goy* who occupies himself in the study of the law deserves death. The money of *Goyim* is forfeit to the Jews, therefore it is permitted to rob them or to cheat them. . . It is forbidden to give back to a *Goy* an article which he has lost.¹ It can hardly be objected that it was an extravagance of officiousness which took steps to prevent the teaching of such doctrines to young children. Apart from that the Inquisition only came in contact with Jews if they were accused of attempting to proselytize. As M. Reinach fairly puts it 'L'église ne défendait pas aux Juifs d'être Juifs, mais elle interdisait aux chrétiens de judaïser et aux Juifs de les pousser dans cette voie.'²

It is justly urged that one of the great evils of the inquisitorial system was the concealment from the defendant of the names of his accusers. The defence of this custom was that his brother heretics would be likely to take vengeance on the delator of a heretic. Such a defence might justify the concealment of names during some particular reign of terror, when it could definitely be proved that there was a real risk of vengeance. Yet through the greater part of its history, and in the greater part of the area over which it functioned, the Inquisition was the weapon of the majority against the minority, and experience proves that unpopular minorities are much more likely to suffer injustice than to commit it. A regular and normal policy of the concealment of names was clearly indefensible.

Nor, it is only fair to say, were the names always concealed. Boniface VIII, when in 1299 he gave leave for the concealment of the names, expressly commanded that this should not be done when it was not absolutely necessary, and, when the Jews of Rome appealed to him to compel the Inquisition to give the names of their accusers, Boniface commanded that the names be given.³ In 1319 Bernard Délicieux was allowed to be confronted with sixteen out of his forty accusers.⁴ Nor, even where the names were not given to the accused, must we imagine that

¹ Isidore Loeb, *La Controverse sur le Talmud sous Saint Louis*, p. 8

² 'The Church did not forbid Jews to be Jews, but she did forbid Christians to become Jews or Jews to attempt to persuade them to do so'—Article in *La Revue des Études juives*, 1900

³ Lea, op. cit., 1, p. 494

⁴ Ibid.

one sole inquisitor had the right to judge the evidence alone. According to the Bull of Urban IV, of the 16th March 1261, *Licet ex omnibus*, no sentence could be pronounced until the whole evidence, names and all, had been submitted to the assistants, or *boni viri*, who formed a sort of jury. The giving of false witness was most severely punished. When a false witness was unmasked, Lea tells us, 'he was treated with as much severity as a heretic. . . . He was generally thrown into prison for the rest of his life.'¹

There is, unfortunately, no question that torture was one of the regular weapons of the Inquisition, that it was used not, curiously enough, as a punishment, but specifically in order to compel poor wretches to reveal their accomplices, that it was not only used in practice but specifically commanded by the highest authority, and there is no doubt that in practice not only defendants, but sometimes even mere witnesses, were put to the torture. There is, unfortunately, no doubt that this is the intended meaning of Innocent IV's Bull, *Ad extirpanda*, of the 15th May 1252.² Little purpose is served by asking whether the Inquisitors were worse than sixteenth-century Elizabethans or by drawing comparisons between their methods and those of the police in the present-day United States. The only relevant comparison is the comparison between their spirit and that of Christ and, in whatever other ways the modern Christian may be a worse man than his medieval ancestor, yet he can at any rate justly be amazed that men who honestly sought to bring in the reign of Christ on earth should have had so little confidence in God that they thought that His purposes could not triumph save by the use of such extraordinary means. It is true that wise and conscientious Inquisitors, such as Eymeric, attached little importance to confessions extorted upon the rack. 'Quaestiones sunt fallaces et inefficaces',³ he declares. He agreed with the later verdict of Shakespeare

Ay, but methinks you speak upon the rack
Where men enforcèd will speak anything

¹ Lea, op. cit. 1, p. 499

³ 'The torture is untrustworthy and inefficacious'

² *Bullarum Amplissima Collectio*, III, p. 320

But if the rack was ineffective even of its horrid purpose, it is the more extraordinary that authority permitted its continued use. And, in point of fact, it is evident that the very possibility of torture destroyed the reliability of even the so-called 'free' confession. For the wretch who confessed without being tortured did so knowing very well that he might be tortured if he did not confess.

It is hardly less irrelevant that the use of torture was a commonplace of the secular justice of those cruel times. For there should be no parallel between the justice of the Church and the justice of the State. Those who believe in the Church at all believe that she has God's promise that she will not perish. The State has no such promise, no such Divine guarantee, and must therefore save herself as best she can, never, it is true, by injustice, but sometimes, inevitably, by horrid severity.

The argument from the cruel spirit of the times, also, neglects the most important truth that what was done in the name of the Church in the thirteenth century would have been repudiated with horror by the whole authority of the Church during the first eleven centuries of her existence. So far from using torture herself, she had done all that she could to prevent the State from using it. 'Torture', said Pope Nicholas I in the ninth century, 'is not permitted either by divine laws or by human laws.'¹ The Decree of Gratian, the twelfth century's code of canonical procedure, teaches 'Confessio non extorqueri debet sed potius sponte profiteri'.² It was not that the thirteenth century had not yet risen to the standards of the twentieth, it was rather that she had fallen enormously below those of the eleventh. The confusion comes from the agreement of both the Church's disciples and her enemies to consider the thirteenth century as the high-water mark of Catholic civilization. Intellectually, artistically, materially, it was perhaps the high-water mark, but there were great dangers in an assumption of the responsibility for civilization. It would be idle to attempt to deny that she fell before some of these dangers. The countenancing

¹ Labbe, *Concilia*, viii 544.

² 'A confession ought not to be extracted by torture but given freely.'

of torture is an example. It is perfectly true that the Papal permission of torture was hedged about by certain conditions. It must be 'citra membra diminutionem et mortis periculum',¹ 'not such as to endanger life or limb'. It must not be used save as a last resort when all other methods have been exhausted. It must only be applied once—though by a refined distinction the single performance might be adjourned and continued on a subsequent day. The bishop had to give his consent before it was applied.² In the records of the Inquisition, Lea admits, 'the allusions to torture are singularly rare'. For instance, in 636 sentences passed by the tribunal of Toulouse between 1309 and 1313 there is only one mention of its employment. Yet in face of the appalling truth that the Popes sanctioned its employment at all, such petty details are of little importance.

Innocent III, as has already been mentioned, had in 1205 forbidden lawyers to offer their services to those accused of heresy. This prohibition was not maintained, and by the fourteenth century Eymeric, in the *Directorium*, is able to teach 'Defensiones iuris sunt ei concedendae et nullatenus denegandae. Et sic concedetur sibi advocatus probus tamen et de legalitate non suspectus vir utriusque iuris peritus et fidei zelator et procurator pari fama'.³ And there is evidence that from the very first counsel was in point of fact allowed. On this point the inquisitors proved themselves more humane than the Popes and refused to obey their instructions in the fullest rigour.

It is clear that such writers as Lea and M. Tanon⁴ greatly exaggerate when they claim that nobody ever escaped from the Inquisition with a complete acquittal. Bernard Gui had the reputation of a severe inquisitor. Between 1308 and 1323 he pronounced 930 sentences at Toulouse. They were '132 impositions of the cross, 9 pilgrimages, 143 services in the Holy

¹ *Bullarum Amplissima Collectio*, II, p. 326

² Clement V, III, 1

³ 'Counsel is to be allowed to him and by no means denied. And thus let him be given, as defender, a man upright and whose qualifications are above suspicion, a master both of civil and canon law, zealous for the faith and of reputation equal to his zeal'—*Directorium*, p. 446

⁴ *Histoire des Tribunaux de l'Inquisition en France*

Land, 307 imprisonments, 17 formal sentences of imprisonment pronounced on deceased persons, 42 handed over to the secular arm, 3 deceased persons handed over formally to the secular arm, 69 exhumations, 40 sentences of contumacy, 2 to the pillory, 2 degradations, one exile, 22 houses to be razed, one Talmud burnt. Lastly, 139 complete acquittals.¹ The proportion that was handed over to the secular arm was never high, and in the execution of sentences of imprisonment there seems to have been a surprising eccentricity. On the 13th September 1250, the bishop of Carcassonne gave permission for Alazais Sière, 'immurata pro criminis hereticae pravitatis',² to have seven weeks' leave of absence from the prison to go 'ubicumque voluerit'.³ Five weeks' leave was given on the 9th May 1251 to Guillaume Sabatier. Raymond Volguier de Villar-en-Val, whose leave was to have expired on 20th May 1251, was given a week's extension to the 27th May. The widow Pagane got two months' leave from 15th June to 15th August 1251. It was definitely decided as a matter of principle by the bishops of Southern France in 1244 that 'Si forte per incarcerandi absentiā evidens mortis periculum imminaret liberis vel parentibus, obviare curetis periculo, provideri talibus faciendo, si potestis aliunde, aut carceris penitentiam prudenter in aliam commutetis, oportet enim in tali articulo rigorem mansuetudine mitigari'.⁴ In obedience to this principle even one of the severest of all inquisitors, whose harshness became legendary, Bernard de Caux, in condemning a relapsed heretic to life-imprisonment in 1246, gave leave for the condemned man to remain with his old father, a good Catholic, during the father's lifetime.⁵ One would have thought that nowhere could a dangerous heretic be more dangerous than at the death-bed of a beloved parent or child. If he could be safely trusted there, why could he not be

¹ Douais, *Documents*, I, p. ccv

² 'Incarcerated for the crime of heresy'

³ 'Wherever she wished'—Douais, *Documents*, II, p. 132, nn. 29, 64, 66, 67

⁴ 'If by chance evident danger of death should through the absence of a prisoner threaten either his children or his parents, you are to do all you can to meet such a danger and either to make provision for such circumstances by your action, as you may be able, or to change the penalty of imprisonment to some other, for in such circumstances severity ought to be mitigated by kindness'—Doat, *xxi*, pp. 155–68

⁵ Vacandard, *L'Inquisition*, p. 24.

CORRIGENDUM

Page 694, line 6 *For '139 complete acquittals' read '139 educti e muro'* The educti e muro were not 'completely acquitted' They were condemned persons who, after having served a period of imprisonment, had their imprisonment commuted for other penalties. The Inquisition retained the right of recalling them to prison 'sine nova causa' Condemnation usually implied confiscation of property, there is no particular evidence of the fate of the property of these persons

CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS

safely trusted in the world at large? It is difficult to grasp the principle on which such concessions were based, or to make sense of them, unless we assume that the imprisonment for heresy was not any longer considered, as it had been at first, as the isolation of a poisoned element from a diseased society lest it might infect the whole, but rather as a direct punishment for wickedness—a punishment in itself pleasing to God.

That such notions came to prevail cannot be fairly doubted. The Inquisition was founded on the plea that extraordinary measures were necessary to save society and the purity of faith from the menace of Catharism. In this purpose it was rapidly successful—or, at the least, Catharism, whether owing to the activities of the Inquisition or for other reasons, rapidly ceased to be a menace to the order of society. After about 1340 one hardly hears mention of Catharists¹ ‘La secte’, writes M. Schmidt, ‘disparut sans laisser de traces dans nos provinces méridionales’² In Spain ‘en 1292 on trouve les dernières traces de l’hérésie cathare en ces provinces . . . depuis ce temps on n’entend plus parler en Espagne’³ Isolated little communities lingered on in the mountain districts of Italy and in Corsica, and the Waldenses were no doubt to some extent infected with Catharist ideas, but it was impossible to pretend that the Catharists were any longer in any way a menace to the general European society. Catharism in any strength was found only in the Balkan peninsula, where, if it was a menace, it was a menace to the purity of the Greek rather than the Roman Church. Yet the Inquisition was not disbanded when the *raison d'être* for it vanished. The thirteenth century tolerated the Inquisition because it was frightened, the fourteenth because it had come to think the punishment of heresy a good thing in itself. ‘En fait’, truly writes M. Vacandard, ‘les tribunaux de l’Inquisition ne condamnèrent pas seulement les hérésies qui étaient de nature à causer un trouble ou un bouleversement

¹ *Histoire et doctrines des Cathares*, 1, p. 360.

² ‘The sect disappeared without leaving any traces of itself in our southern provinces’

³ ‘In 1292 we find the last traces of the Catharist heresy in these provinces . . . after this time we do not cross it again in Spain’

social, ils frappèrent toutes les hérésies en bloc et chaque hérésie comme telle'¹ It is true that there were heretics to be punished, but it could not be pretended that they were sufficient seriously to menace society and, such as they were, it was at least arguable that the Inquisition did more to make them than to suppress them

With the fourteenth century came, however, another new development The Inquisition throughout the thirteenth century had been the weapon of the Church, used for the carrying out of the Church's will In the fourteenth century, while undergoing little or no constitutional change, while still externally what it had always been, it was largely captured by the State and its machinery used for purposes predominantly political

It was in France that this development was most noticeable, and we can find the beginnings of it in the conflict between Philippe le Bel and Boniface VIII at the end of the thirteenth century. Philippe le Bel, filled as he was with the legist conception of the absolute sovereignty of the State, attempted by a variety of edicts to prevent the Inquisition from putting any one on trial until the State officials had first given an *exequatur* The attempt was not wholly successful, and the closing years of the thirteenth century were occupied with a conflict between Philip and Boniface, into the details of which it is not necessary to enter For under Boniface's successor, the Papacy made an all but complete capitulation, and henceforth the French monarchy was able, when it suited its purposes, to obtain verdicts of the Inquisition for purposes that had little or nothing to do with the purity of faith The first and perhaps the most striking example was that of the suppression of the Templars in 1307. The story is obscure and complicated, but there has been little serious question that the motive of the suppression was the desire of the French monarch to get hold of the wealth of an opulent corporation and that, whatever may have been the faults of the Templars, those faults had nothing to do with

¹ 'In fact the tribunals of the Inquisition did not condemn only those heresies which were troublesome or a social menace, they struck at all heresies in general and each heresy as such'—Vacandard, *L'Inquisition*, p. 284

heresy. The instrument through which the machinery of the Inquisition was used for Philip's purpose was Guillaume de Paris, at one and the same time Grand Inquisitor and Philip's confessor. Clement attempted to prevent the suppression, but in the end weakly gave his consent in the face of threats.

A precedent was set which was not forgotten, and how completely the Inquisition had come to be looked on as a royal court was strikingly shown in 1322, when, in the case of Amiel de Lautrec, appeal against its verdict was made not to the Pope but to the *Parlement of Paris*.¹ In 1328 we find Henri de Chamay described as 'Inquisitor appointed by the King'.² As is only to be expected, the Inquisition's dependence on the monarchy was increased during the periods of the Avignonese Captivity and the Schism, and its processes were used, as in the case of Hugues Aubriot, simply to get rid of a politician who had fallen out of royal favour. Where they had the power, other princes also used the Inquisition for their purposes, the clearest and most famous example being the case of St Joan, condemned by an Inquisitorial court in defiance of the law of the Church, as the trial for her rehabilitation showed, and to serve English political interests.

France was the only country in whose history the Inquisition played a predominantly important part in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In Italy, in Venice, and in Naples, all sentences of the Inquisition had to be submitted to the *exequatur* of the Council. In Germany the Inquisition is not found at all between the middle of the thirteenth and the middle of the fourteenth century. The quarrels of Papacy and Empire, the jealousy for independence of prince-bishops, prevented a vigorous application of Papal policy. In Castile, Aragon, and Portugal the Inquisition played a part, though only a small part. Heresy indeed was suppressed, but usually, as in England, by the direct action of the prince.

Yet the Spanish problem during these years was not primarily a problem of heresy. Her problem was that of finding a *modus*

¹ Dom Vaisète, *Histoire de Languedoc*, I. iv, Preuves, col. 21-22

² Lea, op. cit., II, p. 154

vivendi between the Christians and the large number of Jews and Mohammedans by whom the peninsula was inhabited. In the thirteenth century the Christians had granted a very full toleration both to Jews and Mohammedans, while the Mohammedans in their part of Spain granted toleration to the Christians. As, however, the Christians pushed the Moors back into the corner of the peninsula, the number of Mohammedan subjects of the Christian kings increased. Whatever the policy of the kings, the Christian populace at any rate, engaged as it was in the desperate struggle against the Mohammedan abroad, became less and less willing to tolerate as a fellow citizen a Mohammedan who could hardly fail to sympathize with his country's foes. There were Mohammedan risings, for instance, in Valencia in the middle of the thirteenth century which were supported by the Mohammedan princes of the south and of Morocco. Out of deference to public demand and the necessities of self-preservation, the kings towards the end of the thirteenth century deprived their Mohammedan subjects of certain privileges and closed to them certain professions. To escape these restrictions, some of the Mohammedans became nominally conformist to the Church, while preserving their Mohammedan faith and practising it so far as possible in secret. They were known as *Moriscos*. Many Jews also conformed in the same nominal fashion. The great pestilences of the middle of the fourteenth century had been ridiculously ascribed to them in spite of Papal protest, and they had in consequence been subjected to considerable violence. In 1391 there was an especially bloody massacre, caused, as Pablo de Santa Maria, the bishop of Burgos, explained, 'because God stirred up the multitudes to avenge the blood of Christ'. To escape such treatment many of them feigned conversion. They were known as *Marranos*.

It is easy to understand how such nominal conformity was both by far more offensive to the pious and by far more dangerous to the State than an open profession of another faith. It was against these pseudo-Christians that in 1478 Ferdinand and Isabella obtained leave from the Pope, Sixtus IV, for the establishment of a specifically Spanish Inquisition.

The Spanish Inquisition differed from the medieval Inquisition in that the inquisitors were quite frankly appointed by the King. We have seen how the earlier medieval Inquisition was entirely under Papal control and how in the later Middle Ages the French monarchs managed to a very large extent to make themselves masters of the machine in their territories. The Spanish Inquisition, creature of the age of political absolutism, frankly and overtly recognized its dependence upon the State.

How far the *Moriscos* and the *Marianos* were merely political menaces to the strength and unity of the Spanish State, how far their political conduct was such that they deserved what they got, how far they were the victims of injustice, it hardly falls within the scope of this essay to consider. It is, however, an error to think that because the Inquisition was subjected to political control it was therefore from the first used for merely political purposes. Whatever may later have come to be true, this was certainly far from so in its early years, and, even if Ferdinand was primarily a politician, Isabella was primarily a Catholic. It must be clear enough to any one who has any understanding of the Catholic teaching about the Eucharist that to make mocking use of the Sacrament without belief and simply in order to gain some social advantage must, to a Catholic, seem the vilest crime of which human nature is capable. And, strange as it may seem, the evidence quite certainly proves that some *Moriscos* and *Marianos*, not content with receiving as laymen the Sacrament in which they disbelieved, actually managed to get themselves ordained priests, perhaps even bishops, and consecrators of that which they rejected. For instance, we have record that Andres Gomalz, parish priest of San Martin de Talavera, confessed at Toledo in 1486 that 'for fourteen years he had been secretly a Jew', that he had no intention 'when he celebrated Mass nor had he granted absolution to the penitents who confessed to him'.¹ There were others like Fray Garcia de Tapate, prior of the Jeronymite monastery of Toledo, who, when he elevated the Host at Mass, used to say, 'Get up, little Peter, and let the people look at you', instead of the words of the

¹ Lea, op. cit

consecration, and who always turned his back on his penitents while he pretended to give them absolution¹. Face to face with such appalling confessions, the petty point whether such men's lives were a menace to organized society sinks into insignificance. Even the awful possibility that numerous souls may have been lost through the confidence of people in the integrity of their administration of the Sacraments is of less importance than the enormous insult to God of such lives, rounded off by such confessions. The ordinary arguments for toleration of those from whom God has—or, at any rate, from whom God may have— withheld the gift of faith are here irrelevant. The deed is, as Massinger said of an insult to the elevated Host, 'a deed deserving death with torture'. And few will be so foolishly sentimental as to waste time in sympathy for the fates of such wretches who continued with their blasphemies after due warning of the consequences which they would entail. There is no doubt at all from the records that such strange perverts did exist. Yet to say that they existed and to say that they deserved their punishment is not at all to say that the Spanish Inquisition was justified in all its works. The awfulness and the strangeness of the crime together made it most important that no one should be punished for it except where guilt was absolutely certain.

As to the numbers who suffered from the Spanish Inquisition it is not necessary to pay serious attention to the fantastic figures and yet more fantastic charges of Llorente, or of later writers who have treated him as an authority². Llorente, for instance, professes to quote Mariana as the authority for saying that 2,000 people were burnt by Torquemada in Seville in 1481. What Mariana does say is that 'two thousand people were burnt, besides a large number who lived in the outlying districts'³. He says nothing of the 2,000 being all burnt in 1481, nor of their being all burnt in Seville. As it happens, we have the authority of Gallois⁴ for the number burnt in Seville during the first six months of 1481. It was 298—a number horrible and

¹ Walsh, *Isabella of Spain*, p. 266

² *Histoire critique de l'Inquisition de l'Espagne*, Paris, 1818

³ *Historia general de España*, Madrid, 1650, tom. II, p. 355.

⁴ *Histoire abrégée de l'Inquisition d'Espagne*, Paris, 1828, p. 123

considerable, it is true, but not 2,000 Llorente's figures for the total number of victims of the Inquisition—23,112 burnt and 201,244 penanced—he arrives at by the absurd method of taking from Mariana figures for a short period and a particular district and then multiplying by one factor to get a figure for the whole of Spain and another factor for the figure for the whole duration of the Inquisition

Yet it is not necessary to go to Llorente for evidence that from the first there were abuses in the Inquisition's exercise of power. The Pope is sufficient authority. In a stern brief of the 29th January 1482, Sixtus IV accused the inquisitors of having acted in violation of the rules of canonical justice. But for his desire not to wound the prestige of the King and Queen, he would, he said, have dismissed their inquisitors, and he refused to permit the extension of the Royal Inquisition to the rest of Spain. Ferdinand and Isabella replied by demanding that the appeal from the Royal Inquisition should be not, as was customary, to Rome but to a subject of the Spanish Crown, and to this demand Sixtus, unwilling to precipitate an open quarrel, somewhat reluctantly agreed. The archbishop of Seville was appointed judge of appeal.

The Inquisition continued to be conducted with a rigour and an injustice that horrified Sixtus. So large had been his concessions that there was now little that he could do save appeal to pity. This he did. 'Quia sola clementia est quae nos Deo', he wrote, 'quantum ipsa natura praestat humana facit aequales, regem et reginam praefatos per viscera D N J C rogamus et exhortamus, ut, illum imitantes cuius est proprium misereri semper et parcere . . . parcere velint'.¹ But at the same time in 1483 he made to them the further concession of allowing the extension of the Royal Inquisition to all Spain. Torquemada was appointed the first Grand Inquisitor of the country and the right of appointment of his successor was conceded to the Spanish Crown.

¹ 'Since it is mercy alone, in so far as human nature betrays it, which makes us equal to God, we beg and exhort the aforesaid king and queen through the bowels of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that, in imitation of Him whose property it is always to pity and to spare . . . they be willing to spare'

The *Marranos* showed themselves more capable of organizing an opposition to the royal policy than was the Holy See. At first they tried to use their influence to obstruct the policy in the royal councils. When they failed, they took to violence and rebellion. On the 15th September 1485, St. Peter Arbues, the saintly and merciful inquisitor-provincial of Aragon, was murdered by a *Marrano* while kneeling before the Blessed Sacrament. Rebellion, however, failed, and the only effect of it was to leave public opinion passionately in favour of the use of the Inquisition for the expulsion of all alien elements from the body politic. The Mohammedans suffered for the sins, or, at the least, the miscalculations of the Jews, for when in 1492 the Mohammedans of Granada laid down their arms on a promise of religious toleration, at once clamour arose that the overriding political necessity of unity demanded the breaking of that promise. To their honour Torquemada and Ferdinand Talavera, the archbishop of Granada, fought this base demand.

After Torquemada's death in 1498 the more violent policy prevailed. With the beginning of the sixteenth century all Mohammedans were offered the alternative of conversion or of expulsion from Granada. Only in Aragon and Valencia was the Mohammedan religion to be any longer tolerated. In 1524 Charles V obtained from Clement VII a dispensation from his promise to tolerate it even there. The last of the Mohammedans were expelled and Spain became in theory a purely Catholic country. What would have been the wisest policy to pursue towards the Mohammedan minority in a Christian country which was still at war with a powerful Mohammedan enemy just on the other shore of the narrow Mediterranean Sea, this is not the place to discuss. It is sufficient here to make the point that it was political rather than religious considerations which led to the expulsion of the Mohammedans. That Charles was willing to be opportunist in his treatment of religious dissidents is amply proved by the contrast of his policies towards them in Germany and in Spain.

It was this same desire for political unity which dictated the violent policy of the Inquisition towards Protestants, when they

made their appearance, both in the reign of Charles V and in that of his son, Philip II. It would be idle to pretend that during these years the Papacy was in favour of what would to-day be called religious toleration. Yet at the same time it is quite unfair to attempt to fasten upon it any sort of responsibility for sixteenth-century Spanish policy. That policy was carried out in the teeth of continual Papal protest, the only result of which was that on the 10th May 1558 the Council of the Grand Inquisitor refused to take cognizance of any Bulls of dispensation of penitents coming from Rome and denied the right of the Holy See in any way to mitigate the rigour of the policy of the Royal Inquisition. Its restive intolerance of any attempt by the Papacy to interfere in the so-called Catholic policy of Spain, and the complete impotence before it even of the Spanish hierarchy, was most adequately shown in the controversy between the Inquisition and Pius IV and Pius V over the alleged heresy of Carranza, the archbishop of Toledo. The Inquisition was the instrument of the King and *l'église, c'est moi*, the sixteenth-century Spanish king might almost have said. In course of time more and more crimes of a purely political nature were submitted to it, and in a considerable number of the condemnations for reasons professedly religious, religion was the pretext and politics notoriously the cause. The condemnation of Caesar Borgia for atheism is one clear example of this, that of Antonio Perez for Protestantism another. There was hardly a pretence of justice in either verdict.

The Spanish Inquisition lingered on until its suppression by Napoleon. It was conducted sometimes in face of the protests of Rome, sometimes in mere indifference to Rome. No doubt some of its verdicts were just, but throughout the last two hundred years of its life there was less and less pretence that it was anything but an instrument of political repression. After the fall of Joseph Bonaparte, Ferdinand VII attempted to revive it as a machinery for the punishment of those who had supported the Bonapartist cause, but the day for it was gone and it perished in 1810.

Very different from that of Spain is the story of the Inquisition

in Italy. It has already been shown how the medieval Inquisition was established in Italy as elsewhere and how, in the later Middle Ages in some states such as Venice and Naples, it fell to some extent under State control. Yet, in truth, the Italian temperament does not take easily to persecution and, while there was, of course, no formal concession of anything which a later age might describe as religious freedom, yet there was throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries very little that could be called persecution. The only notable example of it is the burning of Savonarola and his companions at the orders of Alexander VI. Of that it may be said that, whatever view we take of Savonarola's conduct, there can be no question that he had defied ecclesiastical authority in a manner so public and flagrant as almost to compel it to take action of some sort. There can be little doubt, on the other hand, that the Pope would never have sent him to the stake had he not added to his religious disobedience his vigorous support of Charles VIII's political designs upon Italian liberty—designs to which Alexander was, as a politician, vigorously opposed.

In general, the Papacy, if it was at fault at all, was at fault in being, we need not say too tolerant, but, at the least, too indiscriminately patronizing of the new learning, art, and fashions of the Renaissance. It was not until the news from Germany compelled it that the Papacy made any very serious attempt to sift the bad from the good among these fashions. The new policy begins in 1520 with Leo X's measures against Lutheran books and Lutheran propagandists in Venice and Milan. Clement VII continued the policy of his cousin¹.

The name most closely associated with repression in sixteenth-century Italy was that of Peter Caraffa, afterwards Pope as Paul IV. It was in 1532 that he first appears in this connexion, when, as nuncio in Venice, he wrote to Clement, demanding the dispatch thither of a pontifical inquisitor to cope with the menacing growth of Lutheranism.

Clement VII's successor was Paul III, the Pope by whom the whole great policy of the Counter-Reformation was shaped.

¹ Pastori, *History of the Popes*, x 223

Mere suppression was, to this great Pope's mind, a very poor weapon with which to combat error. Yet, while the positive teaching of the truth was the more important task, it was sentimentality not to see that, once the Church undertook responsibility for the preservation of society, there were occasions when suppression of some sort or another was a regrettable necessity. And, if repression there must be, the more efficient the machinery of it the better. Thus it came about that Paul, the Pope who launched the Jesuits, the summoner of Trent, the patron of Michelangelo and Copernicus, was also the Pope who, in his Bull *Licet ab Initio* of the 21st July 1542, instituted a general congregation, or *Suprema*, of the Inquisition under the immediate presidency of the Pope himself.

This *Suprema* was to have supreme control of all inquisitorial activities throughout the world. Caraffa was the moving spirit in it. 'Our first task', said Caraffa, 'must be to punish the great, whenever they are heretics, for the salvation of the lower classes depends on their punishment.' One of its first tasks, a month after Paul's Bull, was to summon before itself Ochino, the vicar-general of the Capuchins, who was suspected of heresy. Rather than stand his trial Ochino fled to Switzerland to Calvin, and the Inquisition had to content itself with arresting and imprisoning some of his subordinates and disciples. It then turned to Peter Martyr Vermigli, the Augustinian, and he, too, fled to Strasbourg. It next attacked Peter Carnesecchi, who was acquitted, and a Spaniard called John Enzinas, notable as the first victim handed over to the secular arm under the reformed Inquisition. At the same time it conducted a vigorous campaign against heretical books. It established subordinate branches of itself at Naples and Milan and prevailed on the Council of Ten to inaugurate at Venice a vigorous campaign against heresy. Obedient to Caraffa's maxim that the great must not be spared, it attacked Vergerio, the bishop of Capo d'Istria, who had been three times Papal nuncio in Germany, and compelled him to flee the country to Tubingen where he made open profession of his Protestantism.

Under Paul's successor, Julius III, who reigned from 1550

to 1555, the same support of the Inquisition was continued. Further branches were established at Ferrara and Florence, and the attempt of the Venetians to associate lay with the ecclesiastical judges, after the Spanish model, was opposed and frustrated. Yet, though vigorous, the repression was not bloody. In Italy then, as always, the extreme penalty was very rare. Baseless rumours of Papal cruelty were current in Protestant countries, but Vergerio—the same who had apostatized and fled rather than face the Inquisition himself—had the honesty to scotch such rumours. ‘Diceres quotidie centum comburi’, he wrote to Calvin, ‘et non est ita, ne unus quidem, tametsi levis quaerad persecutio paucis in locis oborta sit’¹

In 1551 Michael Ghislieri, afterwards Pope St Pius V, was appointed Commissary of the Holy Office. Ghislieri and Caraffa, working together, pursued a vigorous, though again not a bloody, policy. ‘In December 1551’, records Philipson, no friend of the Church, ‘there was celebrated in the capital of Tuscany a grand *auto-da-fé*, 22 heretics took part in it, but only in order to abjure their heresy, only their books and writings were burnt. . . . At Siena, only some poor sorcerers were burnt, heretics were allowed to recant without receiving any punishment or to flee the country’²

In 1555 Caraffa was elected Pope as Paul IV and, as was to be expected, the election inaugurated a yet more vigorous policy. With doubtful wisdom Paul, like the Spaniards, handed over to the Inquisition all sorts of matters of ordinary civil jurisdiction. Even so, burnings were rare, and for the most part of books. ‘This week’, runs a report of the Avvisi of 11th February 1559, ‘they burned four persons, the first alive . . . the other three after death’. More general attention was aroused by Paul’s dramatic arrest of one of the most prominent members of the Sacred College, Cardinal Morone. Morone had perhaps been guilty of some negligence in his pursuit of heretics—if that be so great a crime—at Modena, but he was in no sense a

¹ ‘You say that a hundred are burnt every day. No, there is not even one, although in a few places some slight persecution may have sprung up’—Calvin, *Opera*, xiv, p 636, *Corpus Reformatorum*

² Philipson, *The Counter-Revolution in the Sixteenth Century*, p 232

heretic himself Had the result of the trial led to his condemnation and punishment, it would have been one of the gravest of miscarriages of justice But fortunately, before investigations were completed, Paul died, and his successor, Pius IV, quashed all the proceedings and declared Paul's action unjustified ¹

It was Paul, too, who broke with the great Papal tradition of toleration and protection of the Jews. He confined Jews proper to their special ghettos and fell vigorously upon the *Marranos*, holding a large *auto-da-fé* at Ancona on the 30th April 1556, in which he burnt either 12 or 24 of them—authorities differ—and sent 42 to the galleys. He was the founder also of the Roman *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* Under his rule the Inquisition was extended to Modena and Lucca and re-established in Milan

After Paul IV's death there was a violent reaction against all for which he stood. For a time it looked as if the Inquisition might perish along with all the other instruments which the hated Paul had used Carnesecchi wrote to Julia de Gonzaga: 'Your Excellency will have read that the Holy Inquisition has met that same death which it was accustomed to inflict upon others '² But in face of the menace of growing Protestantism, Pius IV, the new Pope, did not feel able to dispense with this weapon Instead, he reorganized and, if anything, extended its authority Ghislieri summoned before him eight French bishops suspected of Huguenotism Catherine de Medici refused to recognize his right to issue such a summons, and throughout the reign of Pius this dispute upon jurisdiction between the Pope and the Queen-Regent continued.

On Pius IV's death it was Ghislieri himself who succeeded him as Pius V. Vigour and repression were again the watchwords of the day 'The more that you use mildness towards it [heresy]', he wrote to Catherine de Medici on the 27th June 1566, 'the more does its brazenness increase.' Yet again, though vigorous, repression was not, by the standards of the time,

¹ Pallavicini, *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*, xiv. 15 ²

² Philipson, op. cit., p. 201.

bloody. At the great *auto-da-fé* of the 23rd June 1566, there was only one capital punishment, and he a heretic several times relapsed, who had finished by having himself circumcised in order to marry a Jewess¹ Moreover, he was decapitated before being burnt—as were all the 200 or so victims who suffered the death penalty under St Pius V, of whom the most important was Carnesecchi, once secretary to Clement VII—he who had already been acquitted under Paul III, and who had too soon rejoiced at the passing of the Inquisition at the death of Paul IV. St. Pius would have spared his life had he confessed his errors, but he refused.²

After St. Pius' death there were no notable developments in the history of the Holy Office. On the one hand there was, of course, no pretence that religious freedom was permitted in territory in which the Papal will could make itself felt any more than there was anywhere else in Europe at that date. On the other hand, the work of the Holy Office was mainly concerned with the denunciation of books and doctrines. The punishment of persons was rare and their violent punishment rarer still. Partly this was due to the fact that the religious divisions of Europe were with the latter half of the sixteenth century becoming more and more definitely geographical divisions. Protestantism's attack on Italy had failed, and Italian Protestants were rarely punished because they rarely existed. But, apart from that, credit must be given to the Popes who, while never denying that in the last resort temporal weapons must be used to suppress spiritual disorders, yet, unlike almost all the temporal rulers of the day, Protestant or Catholic, never forgot that those weapons were only to be used in the last resort and when all else had failed. Nor can it be shown that they ever, like the Spanish Inquisitors, committed the terrible sin of allowing this awful weapon of the Church to be used for purely political purposes.

Interested clamour brings up against the Roman Inquisition its burning of Giordano Bruno, its persecution of the Quietists,

¹ Pastor, op. cit. viii. 643.

² *Journal de Cornelio de Fermo*, quoted by Pastor, viii. 636.

or the hoary story of Galileo. As to Bruno, it is sufficient to say that he was burnt on the charge of atheism of which, as his published works prove, he was undoubtedly guilty. That the Catholic Church was not alone in seeing in his doctrines a menace to society is evident, since he had already been excommunicated by the Calvinists at Geneva and by the Lutherans at Helmstadt and expelled from England by the Elizabethan government and from France by the none too fanatical Catherine de Medici. He wantonly asked for trouble by deliberately putting himself into the hands of the Inquisition after having previously defied its authority by throwing the inquisitor into the Tiber and fleeing the country. The gift of faith is a gift of God, it is therefore, many have argued, unjust to persecute for heresy. But no such gift is required for the belief in God's existence which the unaided Reason demonstrates. Since the French Revolution the modern State has generally tolerated even atheism, but it is only fair to the Roman Inquisition to remember that such pre-Revolutionary apostles of liberty as Locke and Rousseau were of the opinion of the Inquisition rather than of the modern State.

The story of Galileo is mainly interesting as an example of the great growth of leniency which had come in with the sixteenth century. The Copernican system of astronomy appeared to demand that certain passages in the Scripture had to be taken in a non-literal sense. Therefore a decision of the Holy Office of 1616 ordered that those who discussed the system should discuss it only as a hypothesis. In spite of this, Galileo wrote a *Dialogo degli due massimi sistemi del mondo* in which he spoke of the system as a proved fact. Mgr Riccardi told him that his work could only have an *imprimatur* if he added to it a preface and a conclusion, making it clear that the Copernican system was only a hypothesis. Galileo agreed, but, returning to Florence, in 1632 produced his dialogue with Riccardi's *imprimatur* attached to it, and with a preface and conclusion in which the doctrine of the hypothesis was put forward indeed, but put forward in a manner plainly intended to be ridiculous. For this he was put on his trial before the Holy Office. He was given a fair trial and at the

end of it condemned. He at once accepted the verdict and repudiated his error in having disobediently spoken of his hypothesis as proven. The tale of *e più si muove* is quite without evidence. He was banished to his own villa of Arcetri, near Florence, where he lived out the rest of his life, performing with punctuality and fervency all the duties of religion.

As for the Quietist question, it lies outside the scope of this essay. For there was no persecution. To condemn is not the same as to persecute, and all that the Holy Office there professed to do was to declare that the doctrines of Molinos and Petrucci were not Catholic doctrines. It did not punish them for having taught such doctrines.

In Spain and Italy the attack of the Reformation was defeated. In France the victory of Catholicism was partial. The country remained a Catholic country but a Protestant minority survived.

In France the Church had little say in the policy to be adopted towards heresy. Traditions of Avignonese captivity and conciliar claims, of pragmatic sanction and Gallican liberties had left to the kings of France a firm determination that the Prince should decide whether heresy should be suppressed or not. Neither Pope nor bishop were to interfere, whether to advocate severity or to deprecate it.

Even before the appearance of Luther language not unlike that which would have been later called Protestant had been used by Lefèvre d'Étaples who spoke of 'bringing back religion to its primitive purity'. His teaching was in no kind of way discountenanced by the King—rather the contrary—and, when Lutheran influences first began to seep into France, Francis I encouraged them rather than otherwise. He had, it is true, himself no especial sympathy with Lutheran theology (he had, indeed, no great understanding of theology, whether orthodox or heretical) but, as a patron of learning, he conceived it to be his duty to encourage all forms of speculation. He even proposed to make Melanchthon President of the Collège de France.

His whole policy was changed by the discovery one day in 1534 of a number of blasphemous placards abusing the Mass and the Catholic religion, set up in various cities of France and

even on the doors of the royal château of Amboise. If this was Lutheranism, he argued, then its growth could not but lead to a weakening of the unity of the French State. An inquiry was ordered, a number of Lutherans sent to the stake. The new policy of persecution continued for eleven years until it culminated in 1545 in the massacre of the Vaudois by d'Oppède, President of the *Parlement* of Aix. Yet so far the policy was entirely a policy of the State and, though the massacre was a reprisal for Calvinist persecution of the Catholics nine years before, yet it had only been carried out in the teeth of the protests of prominent churchmen such as du Bellay, archbishop of Paris, and Sadolet, bishop of Carpentras.

However in the 1540's there appeared in France the new teaching of Calvin—far more dangerous than that of Luther. Different as Calvin's *Institutes* and the history of Geneva prove that their conduct would have been had they come to mastery of the State, yet it cannot be pretended that the French Calvinists in these early years preached politically subversive doctrines. At this date few, if any of them, were of sufficient social rank to give them any political influence, and, in obedience to Calvin's instructions, they were careful not to give offence. Yet, on the monarch-worshipping code of the day, to differ from the creed of the King was in itself an offence, and after his experience with Lutherans Francis was in no mind to try chances with Calvinists. The Calvinists were vigorously persecuted. Between 1547 and 1550 the *Chambre Ardente* of sinister name condemned more than 500 to retract their beliefs or else to meet either imprisonment or the stake.

Possibly the policy of persecution might have succeeded had not the whole nature of the problem been changed by the accession to the Calvinists in the middle of the century of a substantial proportion of the nobility, including Antony of Bourbon, King of Navarre and member of the French royal family, his brother, the Prince de Condé, and Admiral de Coligny, nephew of the premier Baron of Christendom. The new recruits at once assumed the leadership of their co-religionists and proceeded to set about the attempt of transforming them into a political

party. Calvin from Geneva attempted to dissuade the Huguenots from joining in Condé's plans¹ but with only partial success. In 1560 the conspiracy of Amboise was formed, the purpose of which was the capture of the King Francis II by the Huguenots out of the hands of the Catholic Guises.

That conspiracy marks the beginning of a new period—a period of roughly a generation—that is filled with what are known as the eight Wars of Religion. An attempt was made by the Colloquy of Poissy to discover a method by which Protestants and Catholics could live together in the same State, but in spite of the efforts, from their different points of view, of Catharine de Medici and the Cardinal of Lorraine, the attempt failed. In the next year came the massacre of Vassy and the wars began.

The pages on which they are recorded are among the most sordid of history, but it is not within the purpose of this essay to rewrite them here. It is sufficient to say that any generalizations which attempt to make of one party the innocent victims and champions of toleration, of the other the unjustified aggressors, betray a misunderstanding of the temper of the times. In the philosophy of neither side was there any room for toleration of the other. Each was anxious to get control of the government and thought that its ambition could only be achieved by the defeat of the other. The answer to the question which side began the quarrel merely depends upon what arbitrary date you select for the quarrel's beginning. If you choose to date it from the day of the *Placards*, the Protestants began it. If you date it from the establishment of the *Chambre Ardente*, the Catholics; if from the conspiracy of Amboise, the Protestants, if from the massacre of Vassy, on the whole, the Catholics—though the blacks and whites of it are not quite definite. At any rate the inquiry is of little profit.

It is, of course, right to correct popularly mistaken beliefs such as the mistaken belief that the famous massacre of St. Bartholomew was an unprovoked attack of Catholics upon Huguenots. Horrible as this massacre was, unprincipled as were the motives

¹ Evenett, *Cardinal of Lorraine*, p. 71

which led Catherine de Medici to unloose it, it is only fair to remember that there had, on the previous St. Bartholomew's Day of 1569, been a Huguenot massacre of Catholics at Orthez in the south of France,¹ and that the Catholic Parisians who did the work of killing did it in the belief that they were taking part in an act of reprisal.² Yet the correction of such mistakes does not alter the truth that both sides looked upon themselves as engaged in a war, in which, as in all wars, honourable men fought only with honourable weapons and others were less careful of the means that they used.

The only people who advocated anything of the nature of religious toleration were those who were notoriously indifferent in their own convictions. Catherine de Medici is the most obvious example, and that it was no very noble and disinterested love of freedom which led her to toy with plans of toleration is already proved by the fact that she, who summoned the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561, unloosed the St. Bartholomew in 1572.

Yet, when experience showed that Protestantism could not be easily and rapidly crushed as it had been crushed in Italy and Spain, an increasing body of opinion became prepared to support some form of toleration, not as a desirable principle but as a compromise, the only condition of escape from intolerable and unending civil war. The accident of heredity put upon the throne a man well suited for the carrying out of such a policy—Henry IV, an ex-Huguenot who had accepted Catholicism as the price of the throne. Hence the Edict of Nantes in 1598, by which the Protestants were allowed to practise their religion in certain specified places and were allowed to fortify their towns and establish them as all but independent republics. Through this accident of her history France in the seventeenth century was possessed of a much larger religious toleration than any other country of Europe. The experiment was not altogether a success, for the Huguenots were in a position to call in their country's enemies and did not scruple to make use of their

¹ Favyn, *History of Navarre*, pp. 858, 859.

² For a discussion of the Papal attitude to St. Bartholomew see Pastor, xix, pp. 501 et seqq.

advantage Richelieu, therefore, by the Grâce d'Alais of 1628 took away from them their political privileges while leaving them their religious liberties. These liberties were scrupulously respected up to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV in 1685. That revocation by the Gallican King had little to do with the hatred of religion or the love of it. It came rather from the determination of the King to tolerate no kind of dissent in any shape or form from the royal will. The horrors of protracted civil war had induced the French people to submit to this unlimited autocracy. How completely they were willing to submit is interestingly illustrated by a sentence from the very plea for leniency which de Bélestat sent to Louis XIV at the time of the Revocation. He wrote 'On donne pour axiome incontestable que, pour qu'un état se maintienne en paix, il faut qu'il n'y ait qu'un roi, qu'une loi, qu'une foi'¹

If it is in France that we find at this time the first examples of toleration, it is in Germany that we find the fewest examples of persecution. The one result, as the other, came not from principle but from accident. There was a brief period during which it looked as if Lutheranism might sweep over the whole of Germany. But by the war in Gelderland of 1543, by the deposition of the archbishop of Cologne in 1547, by the Schmalkaldic War of 1546–7, Charles V was able to check it. But fearful of the menace of Turk and Frenchman, he was not able to push his victory home. By the Religious Peace of Augsburg of 1555 he was compelled to agree with the compromising formula of *cuius regio eius religio*.² This formula, it is true, allowed no place for Calvinists, as the Calvinist Electors Palatine were later to complain. Calvinists had to wait until the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 for their official recognition, and it was where the problem was complicated by their presence that persecution was mainly found. In Austria Calvinists were persecuted by the Catholics, in Saxony by the Lutherans. In the Palatinate, on the other hand, Frederick III and his son, Casimir, turned

¹ 'It is an admitted and incontestable axiom, that if a realm is to maintain itself in peace, it must have one king, one law, and one faith.'

² 'He who has the political power can dictate the creed'

on the Lutherans in the name of Calvinism. The Calvinist elders urged on their prince to the holy work in the strange couplet:

O Casimire potens, servos expelle Lutheri;
Ense, rota, ponto, funibus, igne neca¹

He did. Yet at least Lutheran and Catholic could be sure of finding a home somewhere in the mosaic of petty German principalities.

The Augsburg solution did not, indeed, free Germany from religious disputes, but those disputes, instead of leading to the persecution of individuals, led instead to conflicts between principalities, to the Cologne War of 1582, to the Cleves-Julich dispute, and, chief of all, to the great Thirty Years' War of 1618 to 1648. Germany's neighbours, whether Catholic like France or Protestant like Sweden, were careful to see that none of these conflicts ended in a victory for either side so complete as to put an end to the uneasy division of Augsburg.

It would be foolish to pretend that Catholics of the sixteenth century were in any way the friends of toleration. It is even more foolish to hail the first reformers as the prophets of this liberty. The folly of such a view is so patent that it is not worth delaying long upon it. 'The theory', writes Gardner, 'that Protestantism was more tolerant than Romanism will not bear investigation'² 'So strong and so general was the intolerance of Protestantism', reports the impartially agnostic Lecky, 'that for some time it may, I believe, truly be said that there were more instances of partial toleration being advocated by Roman Catholics than by Protestants'³

As a matter of expediency, Calvin had, as we have shown, urged the Huguenots, being in a minority, to behave in France with moderation. But his *Institutes* made no bones about it that as a principle toleration was quite abhorrent to him. There was only one true Church, he argued, the Church of Calvin, and the first duty of princes was to put an end to Popery, and

¹ 'O mighty Casimir, drive out the servants of Luther Kill them by sword, wheel, water, rope, or fire'

² *Lollardy and the Reformation*, iii. 29

³ *Rise and Influence of Rationalism*, iii. 52

his career at Geneva was to give ample proof of his readiness to apply this principle when his party was in the majority

He arrived in Geneva in July 1536. Already a Protestant government was in power there, having established itself by force and maintaining itself by persecution. Altars had been desecrated, priests thrown into prison, laymen fined for the hearing of Mass. This system Calvin accepted readily and by the 'articles' of 1537 added to it a mechanism of spies and informants for its more efficient enforcement.

In 1538 he was exiled from Geneva, but he was back again in 1541, and suffering had only increased his belief in the holiness of persecution. Calvin's *Institutes* were declared a holy doctrine which no man might speak against and many suffered—sometimes with, and sometimes without, Calvin's direct intervention—for their criticism of the new Genevan Pope. Fifty-eight persons suffered death and seventy-six exile, besides numerous imprisonments, while, if an interference with recreations that are considered entirely innocent by the traditional religion—such as games, the theatre, or dancing—be counted as religious persecution, then certainly persecution was the normal policy of the Calvinist State.

Of Calvin's executions, by far the most famous is that of Servetus. Calvin afterwards pretended that he would have been content with some lesser punishment, but it is certain that it was at his demand that Servetus was arrested, that he replied to the petitions of the Bernese and others in favour of some indefinite penalty that a death-sentence was essential, and that he spoke no word for leniency while Servetus was still alive. His attempt to get the Catholic Inquisition at Lyons to do his burning for him was not especially honourable. Yet to any one who at all understands the principles of Calvinism and of the sixteenth century it is a little difficult to understand why this particular incident is singled out for such an especial fuss. Calvin never attempted to conceal his opinion that those who denied the doctrine of the Trinity deserved to be burnt, nor did Servetus attempt to conceal his complete denial of that doctrine in his *De Trinitatis Erroribus*. Calvin had given him very full warning

of the fate that awaited him if ever he came to Geneva. 'If he comes hither and I have any authority I will never let him quit the place alive'

Calvin's conduct was greeted with the all but unanimous applause of the Protestant world. 'Let the world see', Bullinger wrote to him urging him on to the extreme measure, 'that Geneva wills the glory of Christ.' And after the execution Calvin was applauded by Beza and even by the mild Melanchthon. The only protest came from Castellio, who wrote a pamphlet entitled 'Ought heretics to be persecuted?' which is often spoken of as the first fully developed Protestant plea for toleration. The plea for toleration is to the honour of Castellio, but it is only fair to remember that he had himself been condemned by Calvin as a heretic and exiled from Geneva, thinking himself fortunate to escape with his life. It is common to find the hare more sensitive than the hound concerning the cruelty of blood sports.

Wide generalization is difficult, but it is substantially true to say that north Germany did quite genuinely and spontaneously accept the Reformation. In Holland, viciously as the Protestant party persecuted when they got power, yet again it was a genuine popular will which put them in power. Elsewhere, wherever Protestantism has survived, it has survived by seizing political power and using it to persecute its opponents out of existence. Nor is it possible to draw any very close parallel between persecution by Catholics and persecution by Protestants. For the Catholics were at the least defending an ancient form of society. The Protestants were always seeking to destroy the traditional or to impose by force a new form. The Protestants were alone in attempting to propagate by persecution.

The melancholy history of the sixteenth-century Netherlands is one which can afford little satisfaction to students of any creed. Nowhere was the suppression of Protestantism by Catholic authority more severe, whether by the regular Inquisition before the revolt, or by Alva after it. Nowhere, on the other hand, were there found Protestants less willing to accept mere conditions of toleration. The appalling pillaging of churches in August 1566, William de la Marck's massacre of Catholics at

Gorkum in 1572 alone make intelligible Alva's later atrocities or the Spanish Fury of 1576, just as Alva and the Spanish Fury alone make intelligible the extraordinary intolerance and hatred of freedom shown by the later Orange government of Holland.

When the storms of the Reformation subsided, the Spanish Netherlands were found to remain almost entirely Catholic. Even in Holland, a so-called Protestant country, the Catholics still formed a substantial proportion, probably a majority of the population. Nevertheless it was the policy of the Dutch government to deny all civil and religious liberty, not only to Catholics but also to all variety of Protestants—Anabaptists, Zwinglians, or Lutherans—who refused submission to the official Calvinist creed. The details of the repressive policy varied from date to date and from province to province. Sometimes all non-Calvinistic worship was wholly forbidden, sometimes it was permitted in return for the payment of a fine. But there was no exception to the general tradition of persecution which dominated Dutch domestic policy from the Reformation up to the French invasion of the time of the Revolution.

The Scandinavian countries present a striking example of completely successful persecution. The formula of Lutheranism was a convenient one for princes and Scandinavian nobles as greedy as English ones for monastic spoils. In the sixteenth century the Scandinavian kings turned Lutheran and succeeded completely in imposing their new creed on their subjects. Death was made the penalty for saying Mass and confiscation of goods for adhesion to the Catholic Church, and with these weapons they succeeded in a surprisingly short time in driving the entire population out of the Catholic Church. There was no remnant Catholic minority as in Holland or England.

In Denmark and Norway, which was then dependent on her, the change was easily effected and with little incident. The story of Sweden was somewhat more complicated. The King, Gustavus Vasa, declared Lutheranism to be the religion of the country in 1524, and pursued a policy not unlike that of Henry VIII of England. As little change as possible was made in ritual; as much money was seized from the Church as possible;

the King got himself declared *summus episcopus* of the Church in Sweden, and those who resisted his changes were slain without hesitation or mercy. The success of his policy of 'purifying' the Gospel may be gauged by his will in which he, who had ascended the throne penniless and landless, left a personal fortune of about a million and a half pounds of modern money and 5,000 farms. He was the richest monarch in Europe.

Gustavus's son, John III, had, however, a Catholic wife, Katharine Jagellon of Poland, and was himself converted to Catholicism. He opened negotiations for a return of the country to Catholicism, but they were unsuccessful. His Catholic son, Sigismund, succeeded, and in 1599 John's Lutheran brother, Charles, was able to depose Sigismund and seize power himself. There followed a bloody persecution of Catholics, as a result of which the Catholic religion was entirely destroyed in the country. There was no relaxation in anti-Catholic legislation until 1780.

No country suffered more from persecution than did the British Isles. Henry VIII first repudiated the Papal supremacy, while at the same time sternly refusing to make any change in defined doctrine. Under his rule both Lutherans and those who refused to admit the royal headship of the Church suffered death. The spoils of the monasteries were seized for the pockets of Henry and his courtiers. Henry was succeeded by his little son, Edward VI, a minor. His reign falls into two parts. In the first part Somerset was the Regent, in the second, Northumberland. Northumberland's religious policy was more strongly Protestant than that of Somerset. But both Regents attempted to impose upon the people reformed doctrines. Whatever Catholic practices survived in England survived in spite of, and not because of, the government. There was no question of toleration of dissent, nor any denial, even among the government's supporters, that the changes were intensely unpopular. 'The use of the old religion is forbidden by a law and the use of the new is not yet imprinted in the stomachs of eleven of twelve parts of the realm,'¹ reports Sir William Paget, Chief Secretary

¹ Strype, II, Rec. 100.

to Somerset, in a letter of the 7th July, 1549. There was a rising of the people of the west of England which was put down by foreign mercenary troops. After the suppression, priests were gibbeted on their church-steeple斯 throughout the disaffected areas and batches of the insurgents hanged, drawn, quartered, and seethed at some dozen of the important towns of the west country. Minute accounts of the expenses of these executions survive.

Edward VI was succeeded by his half-sister, Mary, and under her England was reconciled to the Roman obedience, though it was not found possible to restore the abbey lands. At first Mary professed her intention of governing according to a principle of religious toleration, and in merely secular justice and in her suppression of rebellion she was far more merciful than most of her contemporaries. But neither the temper of her age nor of her opponents was suited to toleration, and in her later days she inaugurated a policy of persecution not, indeed, against all those who were not Catholics, but against those who denied any doctrine whatsoever of the Real Presence. 'Is there or is there not anything taken and received in the Holy Sacrament besides Bread and Wine?' was the question asked. It was a question that would have brought to the stake none who held what were afterwards to be the doctrines of the Church of England in whose name her half-sister, Elizabeth, was soon to persecute and, indeed, as a non-Catholic historian, Mr. Smythe, says 'It may be a comforting reflection for a Roman Catholic that at least two-thirds of the martyrs who were burnt by Queen Mary would almost undoubtedly have been burnt in the normal course by the Church of England'¹. Yet it seems that between two and three hundred perished under Mary's rule.

In 1558, under Mary's half-sister, Elizabeth, a new change in policy took place. By the fourteenth clause of the Act of Supremacy of 1559 it was enacted that whoever in any way supported the Papal cause should for his first offence 'forfeit and lose unto Your Highness all his goods and chattels as well real as personal'; for the second, 'incur the dangers, penalties and

¹ Smythe, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI*, p. 3

forfeitures ordained and provided by the Statute of Provisior and Praemunire' The third offence 'shall be deemed and judged high treason and the offender shall suffer pains of death'. By the accompanying Act of Uniformity penalties, graded up to 'imprisonment for life' and total forfeiture of goods were enacted against priests who celebrated Mass or who even spoke in criticism of the substitutes for it which the Elizabethan prayer-book had provided.

The documents of the High Commission by whom this persecution was carried through perished in the seventeenth century It is not therefore possible to give exact statistics of those who suffered under it, but there is no doubt that it was vigorously enforced from the first. During the first ten years of her reign, on the other hand, it could not be pretended that either the Pope, foreign Catholic princes (Philip of Spain was Elizabeth's friend and supporter), or the English Catholics had given any provocation which could at all excuse such a policy. And this in spite of the fact that Elizabeth at her coronation had taken an oath to maintain 'the liberties of the established Church, and the laws, customs and privileges granted to the clergy of her predecessor, St Edward, the Confessor'¹—which meant, if words had meaning at all, to maintain the Roman Catholic Church.

At the end of the decade of the 'sixties, the situation was changed by the first appearance of a policy of Catholic resistance. On the one hand, the year 1569 saw a Catholic rising against the government; on the other, in the year 1570 the Pope, St. Pius V, issued his Bull *Regnans in excelsis*, freeing all Catholics from their allegiance to Elizabeth and calling upon Catholic monarchs to depose her

In point of fact no Catholic monarchs made any attempt to obey the Pope and, in spite of the Bull, great numbers of Catholics—lay and clerical, secular priests and Jesuits—refused in any way to indulge in political opposition to the government, as was to be shown at the time of the Spanish Armada. Yet from the 1570's onwards it was arguable that there was

¹ Pollen, *English Catholics*, 24, 25.

a state of necessary war between the English State and the Catholic Church. The government did so argue, and stiffened still further their already severe laws. In 1571 it was declared high treason to call the Queen a heretic, in 1581 'to move any to promise any pretended obedience to the See of Rome', in 1585 for a priest to come to England. Fines and imprisonment were decreed for the hearing of Mass or for sending children overseas to receive a Catholic education. During these remaining years of Elizabeth's reign some two hundred people were put to death for practising the Catholic religion and another forty at least died in prison. A far larger number suffered long terms of imprisonment and a larger number still were fined.

After the defeat of the Spanish Armada the government, not content with persecuting the Catholics on their right, turned also against the Puritans on their left, and throughout the rest of the reign of Elizabeth and the reign of James I it was attempting to suppress both kinds of dissidents. Even before the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 the laws against the Catholics had been made yet more severe, and after it they were made more severe again.

His strong Catholic blood, the native tolerance of his character, and the growing menace of Puritanism induced Charles I greatly to ameliorate the lot of the Catholics. But, noble as his policy was, his favour to the Catholics, and that of his two sons, brought little benefit to their cause. The persistent and unswerving hatred of liberty of the parliamentary party from the time of Sir John Eliot, at whose demand persecution was reinaugurated, to the defeat of the Whigs by Charles II, made it impossible for either of the Charles to give effect to their natural desire for toleration. Its only result was that Catholicism was identified with the failing Stuart cause, and suffered a persecution of savage violence under the Commonwealth, while the Protestant revolution of 1688 and the failure of the Jacobite rising of 1715 were each followed by further batches of penal laws, the final result of which was almost to destroy English Catholicism by the second generation of the eighteenth century.

The same, or at the least similar, persecuting laws were passed

for Ireland as for England. Yet the problems of the two countries were essentially different, for, whereas persecution succeeded in England, it failed in Ireland. With a Catholic population it was therefore but natural that the story of gradual repression by fine and imprisonment was varied by violent outbreak and violent repression. Motives of patriotism, economic greed, and religion were constantly intertwined. Yet it is safe to say, as a generalization, that the Irish question only persisted because it was a religious question, that the whole purpose of English policy was either to destroy the Catholicism of the Irish, or, if that should prove impossible, at least to assure the Protestant ascendancy over it. Sometimes the attempt was made to enforce this policy by methods of massacre, of which the most infamous are those of the latter half of Queen Elizabeth's reign and those of Oliver Cromwell. There were throughout the whole three hundred years of struggle many sad acts of violence on both sides. Individual Protestants were found in honourable protest against the English policy, in the ranks, and not infrequently at the head, of the Catholic resistance to it. But, whether in peace or in war, the purpose of English policy never varied from the accession of Queen Elizabeth up to the day of Mr. Gladstone.

In Scotland the condition of the clergy in the years before the Reformation was far worse than that of England, and Lutheranism made its appearance there at a time when it was hardly known in England. It was persecuted, and John Knox used afterwards to trace the Scottish Reformation from the burning for heresy of Patrick Hamilton, a commendatory abbot and member of the royal house, in 1528. James V throughout his reign remained an unflinching, and indeed a persecuting, Catholic. After his death in 1542 at Solway Moss the crown passed to his baby daughter, Mary. The Regent was at first Arran, who favoured the Protestant doctrines. A party of nobles, greedy for the spoils of the abbey lands and encouraged by the money of Henry VIII, supported him, and, when he all too late reverted to Catholicism, called in the English forces under the Protector Somerset to overthrow him.

While Mary Tudor was on the English throne, Mary of Guise, mother of the Queen, was able to rule Scotland with a tolerantly Catholic régime. But after the succession of Elizabeth in England in 1558, the return to Scotland of John Knox in 1559, and the death of Mary of Guise in 1560, the lords of the Congregation—as the Protestant party called themselves—backed by English assistance, got into power. Thenceforward the policy of persecuting Catholicism out of existence was steadily pursued, nor during her short period of power were Mary Stuart's efforts to obtain toleration for Catholics of much effect. She has left behind her, indeed, an honourable name as the first prince who ever sought to govern her subjects upon the principle of religious freedom, but her enemies were too strong for her ever to be allowed to put her principles into practice. Either to hear or to say Mass was declared a penal offence, punishable on the third conviction with death. And at the time of the Bothwell marriage even Mary herself agreed to proscribe the practice of Catholicism! With the exception of the short reign of James II the persecution continued with greater or less vigour right up to the eighteenth century.

One may say, then, of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the principle which guided them was that principle of de Bélestat which we have already quoted. 'On donne pour axiome incontestable que, pour qu'un état se maintienne en paix, il faut qu'il n'y ait qu'un roi, qu'une loi, qu'une foi'¹ It is not really of great moment to note whether the protests against this 'axiome incontestable' come from Catholic or Protestant mouths. For toleration was the demand neither of Catholics nor of Protestants, as such, but of members of the minority, of Catholics in Protestant states and of Protestants in Catholic states. It conquered, where it did conquer, because the majority had failed to subdue the minority and men had grown weary of unending civil strife.

¹ See p. 714

INDEX TO VOLUME IV

- Abbeville, Henry IV at, 261
Abelard, quo 674, and Innocent II, 678
Abelly, Louis, quo 326
Abenabo, Adala, Morisco, 266
Aben Humeya, Morisco, 265 f
Abercromby, Fr , in Scotland, 555
Aberdeen, Dominicans, 542, Reformers, 527, 537, *Register*, 530 n, 538 n
Abstinence, Lutherans, 84, 91, Zwingli, 61 f
Acarie, Mme, and Carmelites, 324
Achenbach, H , ref 22 n
Acton, Lord, quo 257
Adalbert II, Bp of Liege, 677
Ad extirpanda, Bull, 691
Adoptionist controversy, 671
Adrets, Baron des, 247
Adrian IV, Pope, Donation of Ireland, 577, 578 n
— VI, Pope, and Lutheranism, 74 f , 170, 179
Advowsons, rights of, 364 f , 375, 381 f
Aeneas Sylvius, quo 26
Africa, St Augustine, 667, Don John, 270, Moriscos, 265, Stucley, 617
Agriculture, feudal, 17 f , Thirty Years' War, 229 f
Aherlow, Fitzmaurice at, 612
Aigues-Mortes, Huguenots, 262, St Vincent de Paul, 326
Aix-la-Chapelle, Lutherans, 291, Thirty Years' War, 291
Alais, Peace of, 714
Alaric II of Toulouse, and Catholics, 671
Albert of Brandenburg, Margrave of Prussia, 85
— of Hohenzollern, Prince-Bishop of Mainz, 42 ff , 50, 83
— Count of Mansfeld, 83
Albigensians, 678, 680 ff
Albuquerque, Abp of Goa, and Xavier, 209
Alcala, Jesuits at, 170, 216, Ximenes, 146
Alcuin, and Charlemagne, 672, 686
Aleander, Girolamo, Legate, 49 f , 180 n
Alen, John, Irish Chancellor, 566, 571, 573 ff , 578, 584
Alençon, D of, 251 ff , and see Anjou
Alexander, Natalis, quo 178.
— II, Pope, and Abp of Narbonne, 676
— III, Pope, and Henry II, 578 n, and Louis VII, 677
Alexander VI, Pope, and Farnese, 180, and Savonarola, 704
— VII, Pope, and Retreats, 327
Alexandria, Theodosius, 668
Algiers, Turks, 266 ff
Allen, William Cardinal, at Douai, 136 f , 208 n, 219 f , 482, and Irish, 613
Allen, J W , quo 402
— P S , ref 457 n
Almaric, s of Simon de Montfort, 682
Aloysius Gonzaga, St , 207
Alsace, and France, 8 n , 306, 308, 311, 314 f
Altamira, historian, quo 282 f
Altenburg, Lutherans at, 73
Altmark, truce of, 305
Alva, D of, 300, and Moriscos, 265, Netherlands, 247, 271 n , 272, 274 ff , 284, 717 f
Amboise, Placards, 113, 237, 711, Treaty of, 247, Tumult of, 243 f , 712
Ambrose, St , al 77, and Priscillian, 669, Ambrosian Library, 206 n
Ameaux, Pieire, and Calvin, 120
America, exploration of, 10 f , 284 f , 230 f , free churches, 85 n
Amiens, siege of, 261
Amsterdam, 270 n , Arminius, 336, Calvinists, 274
Amyrault, Moses, theologian, 338
Anabaptists, 52 f , 71, 78, 90, 94, 96, 272, English, 411, 427
Ancona, *auto-da-fé*, 707, Franciscans, 160, and Papacy, 331
Andalusia, Moriscos, 264 ff
d'Andelot, François, 240, 245 f
Angela Merici, St , 175 ff
Angers, Calvinists, 238, Guises, 257
Anglicanism, 341 ff , 362 f , 384 ff , 396 ff , 401 ff , 414 f , 452 f , 485, Elizabeth, 462 ff , 470 ff , 480 ff
Angoulême, Court of, 8
Angus, Reformers in, 498, Earl of, 551
Anhalt, Reformers, 334, Anhalt-Dessau, 95, Anhalt-Kothen, 83, 88
Anjou, D of (Henry III), 248 ff , 251, and see Henry III of France
— D of (Monsieur), 252, 254, 261, and Elizabeth, 131, and see Alençon
Annates or First-Friars, English, 376, 398, 472, 634, Irish, 653, 655, Act of, 394, 459
Anne, Q of England, and Ireland, 658 f

- Anne of Cleves, 417
 — of Denmark, Queen of James I, 340
 — of Poland, Empress, 85
 Annecy, St Francis de Sales, 323
 Anthony of Bourbon, King of Navarre, 239 f., 244 ff., 711 f.
 Antonio Maria Zaccaria, St., 159
 — Don, of Portugal, 285 n., 289 f.
 Antwerp, Catholics, 177, 222 n.,
 Leicester, 285, Revolt, 273, Spaniards, 277, 279 f., 281, 287
 Appeals, Act of, 651, 655
 Aquinas, St Thomas, *see* Thomas
 Arab invasion, 671
 Aragon, Inquisition, 684, 697, 702,
 and Naples, 15
 d'Arande, Michel, at Meaux, 104 f.
 Archangel, Chancellor at, 13
 Architecture, 21, 41, 557
 Ardagh, Bp of, and Elizabeth, 595
 Ardee, Friary of, 580
 Argyll, Bp of, and Lords of Congregation, 522, 536
 — Earl of, 529, 552
 Arians, 99, 666 ff., 670 f.
 Arius, and Constantine, 666
 Armada, Spanish, 282, 285 ff., 339,
 721 f.
 Armagh, Bps of, 186, 579, 586, 593,
 595, 601 f., 615
 Arminius, 336 f., 339, Arminianism in
 England, 341, 343
 Arnum, Georg von, al 317
 Arnold of Brescia, Catharist, 674, 678
 — Abbot of Citeaux, 681
 Arona, Borromeo at, 205
 Arran, Earl of, 540 ff., 534 f., 723, and
 Cardinal Beaton, 500, 517, 525, and
 Sadler, 498, 506
 Arras, Bp of, 132, Cathari at, 676
 Arrouasian Rule, Canons of, 577
 Aischot, Count, 273
 Arth, William, Dominican, 516.
 Articles, English, *see* Forty-two, Six,
 Ten, Thirty-nine
 Artisans, 21 ff., 106, workmen's clubs,
 23
 Artois, and France, 309, and Spain, 8 n
 Arundel, Ven Philip Howard, Earl of,
 339
 Arveit, Calvinists in, 238
 Asti, Bp of, and Cathari, 678
 Astrain, Antonio, ref 166 n
 Astrology, 228
 Athanasius, St., and Constantine, 666,
 669, 685
 Athens, Thucydides, 233
 d'Aubeterre, M., and Calvin, 116
 d'Aubigné, Theodore-Agrippa, quo
 143 n., 240, 263, 256 f., 259 n., 261
 Aubigny, Calvinists at, 238
 Aubriot, Hugues, and Inquisition, 697
 Audley, English Chancellor, and Gardiner, 403, quo 406
 Aughrim, battle of, 628
 Augsburg, Cajetan at, 215, Confession
 of, 89 ff., 335, 417, Fuggers, 12, 25 f.,
 Hansa, 25, and Henry II, 241, Interim of, 99, Jesuits, 212, Luther, 40,
 45, 73, 95, Maurice of Saxony, 99,
 Peace of, 99 f., 189, 291 f., 303, 313,
 714 f., Servetus, 121
 Augustine, St., quo 64, 194, on heretics, 667, 669, Reformers on, 36, 91,
 195, al 77, 103, 169
 Augustinians, in London, 377, in Ireland, 567, Luther, 34 ff., 73, reforms, 159 f., St Lazare, 327
 Aulic Council, Ferdinand, 300
 Auneau, battle of, 256
 Austin, Mrs., 154 n., 192 n
 Austria, 9 ff., 14, 16 f., Reformers, 292 f.,
 714, *see* Empire, Thirty Years' War
 Auvergne, Cathari at, 674
 Auxerre, Cathari at, 678
 Avellino, Andrea, Theatine, 156
Avertissement des Catholiques anglais, 263
 Avignon, Inquisition at, 697, Popes, 8 n., 128, 331, 710, St Vincent de Paul, 326
 D'Avila, Don Luis, at Alcantara, 265
 — Don Sancho, Netherlands, 277
 Azpeitia, St. Ignatius at, 163
 Azpilcueta, Martín, Canonist, quo 204
 Babington plot, 137
 Bacon, Francis, quo 463 f., 466, 483
Baculus Jesu, destruction of, 573
 Badia, Tommaso, and Paul III, 180 n
 Baile, Michael, and Stapleton, 220
 Balan, P., ref 50, 100
 Bale, Abp of Ossory, 587 ff
 Balkans, Cathari, 695
 Ballads, Scottish, 508
 Balnaves, Henry, 530, 532 f
 Baltic ports, 13, provinces, 333, Seas, Admiral of, 304
 Baltinglas, Viscount, 620
 Bamberg, Bp of, and Philip of Hesse, 86
 Bancroft, Bp of London, 339, 386, 464,
 467.
 Banda Is., Xavier, 209
 Bannez, Fr., O P., Thomist, 215
 Baptism, 53, Reformers, 197, 540, 587
 Barberini, Cardinal Maffeo (Urban VIII), 305
 Barcelona, St. Ignatius at, 170, Treaty
 of, 89, 179
 Barleymont, Count, and Beggars, 273

- Barlow, Bp of St Davids, 430, 497
 Barnabites, foundation, 159, 162, 200,
 207
 Barnes, heretic, 413, 417
 Baronius, Cesar, 204 f, 214
 Barrow, Henry, Independent, 487.
 Bartoli, Daniele, S J, 177
 Barwalde, Treaty of, 306
 Bascio, Matteo de, Franciscan, 160 f
 Basel, Calvin, 113 f, Cop, 112,
 Council of, 518, Erasmus, 81, Ochino,
 161 n, Oecolampadius, 73, Zwingli,
 55 f
 Baskerville, G, ref 381 n, 473 n
 Basnet, Dean of St Patrick's, 572
 Bastwick, Dr, and Prynne, 343 f
 Batifol, Pierre-Henri, ref 139 n
 Batum, trade, 15
 Bavaria, Catholic, 334, Charles V,
 98, Dukes of, 44, 76, 313 *see* Maxi-
 milian, Henry II, 241, Thirty Years'
 War, 230, 299 ff, 305, 307, 311
 Bayne, C G, ref 480 n
 Bayonne, Catherine de Medici, 247
 Bayreuth, agriculture, 20
 Bearn, and Navarre, 8 n
 Beaton, Cardinal, family of, 513 f, and
 heresy, 516 f, 523 f, muide of, 443,
 497 f, 526
 Beaujieu, Edict of, 252 f
 Beauvais, Cathari, 677, 679
 Becanus, Martin, S J, ref 317
 Becket, St Thomas, *see* Thomas
 Becon, John, of Norwich, 476 n, 486
 Béda, Bedier, Noel, and Lutheranism,
 105, 109
 Bede, St, Stapleton, 220
 Bee-keeping, 20
 Beggars' Revolt, 273, 'Beggars' Peti-
 tion', 546, Beggars of the Sea, 276,
 Beggars' Warning, 527
 Bélestat, de, and Louis XIV, 714, 724
 Belgium, separation of, 278, 282, Jesuits,
 208, Richelieu, 309
 Bellarmine, St Robert, S J, *see* Robert
 Bellay, Jean du, Abp of Paris, and
 Vaudois, 711
 Belley, Bp of, 325
 Bellingham, Irish Lord Deputy, 584
 Belloc, Hilaire, quo 123 n
 Benedictines, English, 363, 370, 373 f.,
 Irish, 624, reformed, 159 f
 Benefices, 205, 365, 376, Irish, 566 f,
 569, 602, 622, Scottish, 522, 588
 Benevento, Papal State, 331
 'Benevolences', Elizabeth, 472.
 Benoist, D, ref 263
 Béranger, Viscount of Narbonne, and
 Alexander II, 676
 Berchmans, St. John, *see* John
 Bergerac, Peace of, 253
 Berkeley, Lord, Viceroy of Ireland, 627
 Berlichingen, Gotz von, and peasants, 78
 Bernard, St, and Cathari, 677, 679 n, Luther, 40
 — Gui, Inquisitor, 693 f
 — of Saar-Weimar, Thirty Years' War,
 307 f, 309
 Berne, Calvin at, 716, Council of,
 114 f, Zwingli at, 55
 Berquin, Louis de, heretic, 109, 111.
 Berulle, Cardinal de, 324 ff
 Beuckelissen, Jan, *see* Jan of Levden
 Beza, Theodore, and Arminius, 336,
 and Calvin, 717, quo 106, 108, 126,
 263
 Beziers, Albigensians, 681
 Bible, authority of, 143 ff, in England,
 401 ff, 415, 423 f, 454, 456, Jesuits,
 172, 217 f, 210, 212, Meaux group,
 102, 104 f, Polyglot, 146, Reformers,
 46, 49, 53, 59, 61, 63 ff, 116 ff,
 139 f, 181, 204, 332, 335, 341 f,
 393, Renaissance, 145 f, 151, 368 f.;
 Rheims, 222 n, Trent, 187, 193, 214
 Bilney, heretic, 371, 413
 Bilson, Thomas, Bp of Winchester,
 464 n
 Bishop, Dr, ref 433 n
 Bishops, consecration of, 586 f, 641,
 Denmark, 333, Electors, 13, 97 f,
 English, 129, 133, 345 f, 360 ff,
 402 f, 412, 416 ff, 428 f, 451, 459 f,
 463 f, 468, 474 ff, Irish, 565 f, 570 f,
 577 ff, 589 f, 592 ff, 600 ff, 610, 613,
 625 f, 652, 655, medieval, 21,
 Bishops' Book, 415 f, 418 ff, 422,
 426, *see* Ecclesiastical
 Black, Fr, O P, in Scotland, 510, 542.
 — Rubric, 444
 — Sea ports, 15
 Blarer, Ambrose, Lutheran, 73
 — Christopher, Bp of Bâle, 336.
 Blois, Calvinists, 238, Henry III, 253,
 256 f, Placards, 113.
 Bobadilla, Nicholas, and St. Ignatius,
 171
 Bocher, Joan, heretic, 411 ff.
 Bocskay, Stephen, 293
 Bohemia, Catholic, 330, Emperors, 11,
 296 ff, Inquisition, 684, Lutherans,
 292 ff, Kings of, 84 f, 314, mer-
 chants, 25, and Palatinate, 298, 341,
 Thirty Years' War, 229 f, 232, 294 f,
 301 f
 Bohemian Brethren, 332
 Bohmei, J F, ref 35 n, 36 n, quo 213.
 Boleyn, Anne, 132, 393, 395, 397 n,
 416, 590, and George Browne, 568,
 572.

- Boleyn, Sir Thomas, *see* Wiltshire
 Bollandists, 177
 Bologna, Charles V, 89, 121 n, Council of Trent, 188
 Bolsec, Jerome Hermes, 125
 Bonacursus, ref 674 n
 Bonaparte, Joseph, 703
 — Napoleon, *see* Napoleon
 Boncourt, Collège de, Duperron, 223
 Boniface VIII, Pope, and heretics, 408, 412 n, Inquisition, 690, Philip le Bel, 696, al 143
 Bonivard, Calvinist, 119 f
 Bonn, Cathari at, 679
 Bonner, Bp of London, 383, 414, 420 n, 423, 428 f, 437, 440, and Royal Supremacy, 453
 Bonnet, J., ref 243 n
 Bora, Catherine von, and Luther, 81
 Bordeaux, Leaguers, 257, Priscillian, 668
 Bordet, L., ref 201 n, 203 n, 204 n
 Borgia, Caesar, 703
 — St Francis, *see* Francis
 Borromeo, St Charles, *see* Charles
 — Federigo, Abp of Milan, 206 n
 Borthwick, Sir John, 514, 516
 Bossuet, Jacques, al 110, 322, 330, quo 216, and St Vincent de Paul, 328
 Bothwell, Earl of, and Mary Stuart, 545, 724
 Bouhours, Père, quo 210 n
 Boulogne, Edict of, 251
 Bouquet, M., ref 676 n, 677 n, 679 n
 Bourbon, Cardinal of, 256, 258, Bourbons, 243 f, 248, and *see* Charles of, John of, Conde, Navarre
 Bourchenin, Daniel, ref 125 n
 Bourdaloue, Louis, al 330
 Bourdoise, Adrien, 326, 328
 Bourg, Anne du, 240.
 Bourges, Calvinists, 238, Council of, 182, League at, 257, University, 110
 Bourgoin, humanist, 103
 Boyne, battle of the, 628
 Bozius, on Luther, 185
 Brabant, 272, 281.
 Brabazon, Irish Treasurer, 571, 573
 Bradford, John, 385, 413
 Brady, Hugh, Bp of Meath, 595 f, 602, 614
 Braganza, House of, 321
 Brandenburg, Bprc of, 291, Elector of, 299, 303, Hohenzollerns, 42, 314, Lutherans, 85, 97, 334 f, Ordinances of, 335, Thirty Years' War, 230, 294
 Brant, Sebastian, quo 27
 Brasier, Auditor, and Somerset, 584
 Braunau, Utraquists at, 297.
 Braunsberg, Jesuits, 212
 Braunsberger, Fr, quo 211, 241
 Brazil, trade, 26
 Breda, League of, 272 f, 282
 Brederode, Hendrik van, 274
 Breisach, capture of, 309
 Breitenfeld, battle of, 306
 Bremen, Abp of, 96, 291, Hansa, 231, Reformers, 73, 334, and Sweden, 311, 315, 333.
 Brenz, John, 91, 195
 Brescia, Angela Merici, 176, Inquisition, 684, and Venice, 15
 Breslau, Hansa, 25, and Lutherans, 86
 Briçonnet, Guillaume, Bp of Meaux, 102 ff, 109, and Bible, 147, 153
 Brieger, T., ref 50 n, 101
 Briesmann, John, Lutheran, 73
 Brill, Beggars, 276
 Bristol, Bprc of, 379, Mint, 581
 Brittany, Catholic, 329, and France, 8 n, Irish in, 609, 613, League, 257
 Brodrick, J., S J., ref 211 n, 221 n
 Broet, Paschal, S J., and Ignatius, 172, in Ireland, 579
 Bromato, on Paul IV, 155 n
 Broughty Craig, Duddeley at, 498
 Brown, W E., ref 218
 Browne, George, Abp of Dublin, 567 ff, 571 ff, 581 f, 584 ff, 590
 — Robert, 484
 Bruck, Chancellor, and Luther, 183
 Bruno, Giordano, and Inquisition, 708
 — Père, ref 224 n
 Brunswick, Dukes of, *see* Christian, Eric, Ernest, Francis, Henry, Lutheranism, 85, Thirty Yeais' War, 230, witchcraft, 228
 Brussels, Alva, 274 f, Orange, 280 f, Requesens, 278, Richelieu, 308, Union of, 279
 Bruys, Pierre de, Catharist, 674
 Bucer, Martin, 73, 92, 96, and Calvin, 115, and England, 434 ff, 440 f, 444 ff, 450, 454, 457 n, and Luther, 110, and Philip of Hesse, 97
 Buchanan, George, 495, 497, 500, 512, 514, 516 f, 527, 558
 Buchheim, C A., ref 69.
 Buckingham, D of, 342
 Buda-Pesth, Turks, 89
 Bugenhagen, John, Lutheran, 96, 334, 417
 Bulgaria, Cathari, 674
 Bulkeley, Launcelot, Abp of Dublin, 599
Bulletin du Diaconat, ref 239 n
 Bullinger, Henry, and Calvin, 717, and England, 435, 438, 443 n
 Bulls, Papal, Act against, 641.

- Bundschuh, Peasants' revolt, 78
 Bure, Idelette de, and Calvin, 116
 Burgat, William, Abp of Cashel, 627
 Burgh, Buigo, Roland de, Bp of Clonfert, 573
 Burgundy, duchy of, 8 n, 9, Cathari, 677, and Switzerland, 16
 Burghley, Lord, *see* William Cecil
 Burke, of Castleconnell, 618, John, Ulick, of Clanricard, 612
 Burkhardt, George, of Spelt, 54
 Burnet, Bp, quo 128, 397 n, 402, 419
 Burton, Henry, 343 f
 Butlers of Ormonde, 606, *see* Ormonde
 Butler, Lord, and Irish Reformation, 571, 573
 Bye Plot, 340
- Cabrières, Waldenses at, 237
 Cadiz, Drake at, 138, 285
 Caen, Eudists at, 329
 Cajetan, Tommaso de Vio, Cardinal, and Luther, 40, 45, 49, as Thomist, 215
 — da Thiene, St., 154, 156
 Calais, English, 7, 131, 387
 Calendar reform, 213 n
 Calvin, John, 16, 38, 55, 68, 73, 106 ff, 122 ff, 140 ff, 205 n, 260, 525, and Alva, 274, and Bruno, 709, and Conde, 712, and Cranmer, 435, 455, and Fiance, 238, 242, 244, and Inquisition, 705 f, 715 f, and Papacy, 319, *Catechism*, 117, Commentaries, 107, 110, 111 n, *Institutes*, 113 f, 118, 715 f, *Sadoleto*, *Reply to*, 110 n, 111, 116, *Servetus*, *Defence against*, 121.
 — Charles, 107
 — Gerard, 107
 — Richard, 107
 Calvinists, 20, 102 ff, 117 ff, 193, 336, 714, in Bohemia, 330, in England, 129 f, 463, 468, in France, 263 ff, 329, 711 f, in Germany, 291, 293, 299, 313, 334, 715, Holland, 338 f, in Ireland, 602 f, in Poland, 332, Presbyterianism, 487, Francis de Sales, 222, 322 f, in Scotland, 524 ff, 535 ff, 548 f, 553 f, 558 ff
 Camaldoles, reform of, 159
 Cambrai, Cathari, 677, Treaty of, 89
 Cambridge, chantries, 638, new learning, 369, 433, Presbyterians, 486, Reformers, 383, 393, 440, 468 f, 568, and Royal Supremacy, 355, Whitaker, 221
 Cameino, plague, 160
 Cameron, Dr Annie, ref 523 n
 Camillans, foundation of, 207
 Camillus of Lellis, St., 207
- Campeggio, Lorenzo Cardinal, in England, 387, in Germany, 75, 179
 — Tommaso, at Trent, 186
 Campion, Bl Edmund, 137, 208 n, 482, 600
 Camus, Bp of Belley, 325
 Canada, St Sulpice, 329
 Canisius, St Peter, *see* Peter.
 Canon law, and English Reformation, 406, 418, 440, 461, on marriage, 512
 Cantalice, St Felix de, *see* Felix
 Canterbury, Convocation of, 355, 399, 633, 635, See of, 343, 394, 422, 467, 473 f, 570, 654, Ochino, 161 n
 Capito, Wolfgang, 416, Augsburg, 92, and Erasmus, 66 n, and Wytenbach, 56
 Caprara, Hosius at, 219
 Capuchins, 159, 161 ff, 200, 207, 293, 329, and Richelieu, 304, *see* Franciscans
 Caraccioli, Antonio, Bp of Troyes, 245
 Caraffa, C., ref 316
 — Giovanni Pietro, 154 f, 158, 704 f, and Jesuits, 172, and Paul III, 180, elected Pope, 189 f, *see* Paul IV
 Carcassonne, Albigensians, 681, Inquisition, 694
 Cardwell, Edward, quo 406
 Carew, George, in Munster, 622
 Carlisle, Bp of, 135, 381
 Carlyle, Thomas, quo 456
 Carlstadt, Luther in, 46, 52 f, 148
 Carmelites, 217, 321
 Carnesecchi, Peter, and Inquisition, 705, 707 f
 Carniola, Habsburgs at, 11.
 Caroli, Pierre, at Meaux, 104
 Carracciolo, A., ref 154 nn
 Carranza, Bartolome, Abp of Toledo, and Inquisition, 703
 Carthusians, English, 356, 382, 457
 Cartwright, Thomas, Presbyterian, 486 f
 Cashel, Abp of, 574; Browne at, 573, and Elizabeth, 595, Magrath, 610, Perrot, 612, Synod, 578 n.
 Caspary, Cardinal, and Paul III, 180
 Cassilis, Earl of, and Church lands, 522
 Castellio, Sebastian, 717
 Castile, Inquisition, 684, 697, Moriscos, 266
 Castelnau, Michel de, ref 263
 Castillon, Huguenots, 262
 Castleconnell, *see* Burkes of.
 Castro, Alfonso de, 130
 Cateau-Cambresis, Treaty of, 239, 271
 Catechism, Canisius, 213, Lutheran, 335 Roman, 206, Scottish, 520.

- Cathai, 672 ff
 Catherine of Aragon, Q., 127, 359,
 367, 369, 395
 — de Medici, *see* Medici
 Catholic Associations, Irish, 628
 — Church, position of, 139 ff, 498,
 501 ff, 540 ff, counter-Reformation,
 153 ff, Catholic States, 320 ff
 — Emancipation, 628
 — League, Ratisbon, 76
 Catholics, English, 284 n, 289, 339 ff,
 344 ff, 470, 478 f, 481 f, *see* Recusancy laws, in Scotland, 549 ff, 555,
 in Sweden, 332 f, 718
 Caux, Bernard de, Inquisitor, 694
 Cauzons, M de, quo 689
 Cavour, Count, quo 663
 Cayet, Pierre Victor Palma, ref 263
 Cecil, Sir Robert, 468 f
 — William, 132 ff, 136, 464 n, 468,
 471 n, and France, 246, and Irish
 bishops, 594, 596, 603, and Netherlands,
 275, and Scotland, 530 f, 533 f, 554, and Whitaker, 222, and
 Wilson, 383, *Cecil Papers*, ref 173 n
 Cervini, Cinthia, 221
 — Marcello, Cardinal, 186, 188 f, *see*
 Pope Marcellus II
 Ceylon, Xavier, 209
 Chablais, St Francis de Sales, 222,
 322 f
 Châlons, Cathari, 675 f
 Chamay, Henri de, Inquisitor, 697
 Chambers, R W, ref 357 n, 410 n
 Chambord, Treaty of, 99
Chambre Ardente, 238, 711 f
 Chantal, St Jeanne de, *see* Jeanne
 Chantry, 129, 356, 383, 430, 439,
 472, Chantry Act, 638
 Charente, Calvinists, 238
 Charity, Ladies of, 327
 — Sisters of, 328
 Charlemagne, 12, 258, 671 f, and Industry, 21.
 Charles Borromeo, St., and Cantalice,
 162, and Giberti, 157 f, as mystic,
 225, and Neri, 205 f, seminaries,
 201, Switzerland, 336, and Ursulines,
 176
 — of Bourbon, Constable, 86, 156 f
 — of Burgundy, the Bold, 56
 — V, Emperor, 9 ff, 47, 121 n, agents
 of, 304, and England, 131, 459, and
 Francis I, 15 f, 74, 97 f, 105, 164,
 Inquisition, 703, and Lutherans,
 49 ff, 76, 83 ff, 89 ff, 92, 94 f, 152,
 714, Moors, 264 f, 702, Netherlands,
 271, and Ortiz, 210, sack of Rome,
 86, 156, and de Soto, 215, and Trent,
 179, 188
 Charles I, K of England, 7, 319 f,
 341 f, 722, and Ireland, 625 f
 — II, K of England, and Ireland, 627,
 656 f, and Whigs, 722
 — VIII, K of France, and Italy, 704
 — IX, K of France, 244 ff, 252, and
 Huguenots, 247 f
 — X, French Pretender, 258, 260
 — IX, K of Sweden, 333, 719
 Charmoisy, Mme de, and Francis de
 Sales, 323
 Charnacé, Hercule de, and Sweden,
 305 f
 Charolais, and Spain, 8
 Chartres, Henry IV, 261
 Châteaubriant, edict of, 238
 Château-Thierry, Anjou, 254
 Châtelaerault, see Arran, Earl of
 Châtelleiault, Huguenots at, 262
 Châtillon-des-Dombes, St Vincent de
 Paul, 327
 Châtillon, Cardinal de, 245
 — family, 240, 247, and Francis II,
 243 f
 Chaucer, al 26
 Cheke, Sir John, 442
 Chertsey, conferences, 435
 Chester, Bprc of, 379
 Chichester, Stapleton, 219
 Chièti, Caraffa at, 155
 Chieregati, Francesco, 74
 Chigi, Fabio (Alexander VII), 327
 Child, G W, ref 367 n, 464 n
 China, silk trade, 15, Xavier, 210.
 Choisy, M, quo 117
 Christian of Brunswick, 300
 — III, K of Denmark, 333
 — IV, K of Denmark, 228, 301 ff,
 305
 — V, K of Denmark, 334
 Chrysostom, St John, *see* John
 Church registers, English, 420
 Cisneros, Dom Garcia de, 167, 169
 Citeaux, monastery, 680 f
 Clanricard, Earl of, 592, 612, 618
 Clarence, D of, al 186 n
 Clarendon, Assizes of, 679, Constitutions of, 365, 565
 Clavius, Christopher, S J, and Calendar, 213 n
 Clement, Jacques, and Henry III, 257
 Clement V, Pope, and Inquisition, 689,
 693 n, and Templars, 697
 — VII, Pope, 156, and Charles V, 86,
 89, 702, and Henry VIII, 387, 394 f,
 and League of Cognac, 84, and
 Lutherans, 75 f, 179, and Orders,
 161, 176
 — VIII, Pope, and Henry IV, 261, and
 Ireland, 622

- Clenoge, Maurice, and Ireland, 613
 Clerc, Alix le, Canonesses, 324
 Clerc, Jean le, 106
 Clergy, benefit of, 370, celibacy of, 52, 57, 62 ff, 91, 189, 512 ff, 518, 521 f, 536, 638, condition of, 48 f, 76 f, 142 f, 148 f, 151, 157, 180, Counter-Reformation, 190 ff, 197, 200 ff, 213, 322 ff, 325, English, 133, 136 f, 363 ff, 405, 415, 421, 423, 430, 433, 438, 470, 633 f, Irish, 571 f, 580 f, 583 ff, 592, 596, 614, 618 f, 622, 624, 657 f, Scottish, 498 f, 507 ff, 511 ff, 539, 546 f
 Clermont, Maldonado at, 218
 Cleves-Julich dispute, 715
 Clichtowte, Josse, 103 f
 Clichy, St Vincent de Paul, 327
 Clogher, Meiler Magrath at, 601
 Clonfert, Bps of, 573, 592, 595
 Clonmel, Alen at, 574 f, Peirot, 612
 Clovis the Frank, and Arians, 670 f
 Cluniac reform, 380
 Coblenz, Jesuits, 212
 Coburg, Luther at, 90
 Cochlaeus, Johann, 208
 Cockpen, school, 559
 Codure, Jean, and St Ignatius, 172
 Coelius, Reformer, 185
 Coimbra, Suarez at, 216
 Cognac, Calvinists at, 238, League of, 84
 Coke, Sir Edward, quo 406
 Colet, John, 146
 Coligny, Admiral de, 240, 243 f, 246 ff, 249 f, 711 f, Netherlands, 276
 Cologne, Cathari, 679, Diet of, 29, Electorate of, 13, 98, 291, 715, Hansa, 25, Jesuits, 210, Lutherans, 714, Thirty Years' War, 232
 Colonna, Admiral, 267
 Columbus, Christopher, al 10
 Comenius, Amos, 234
 Commendatory abbots, 505
 Commendone, Gian Francesco, Bp of Zante, 190, 332
 Common Prayer, Book of, *see* Prayer Book
 Communion, in both kinds, 76, 91, 189 f, 421, 431, 435, 637 f, *Order of*, 436, 582 f, Service, 435 f, 582, *see* Eucharist
 Compiegne, edict of, 238, Treaty of, 308
Complaynt of Scotland, 508
 Condé, Prince of (Louis I of Bourbon), and Huguenots, 243 f, 246, 711, son of, 248, 252, 254
 — Prince of (Louis II of Bourbon), 310
 Condren, Père de, 326
Confessio Gallicana, 241
 — *Tetrapolitana*, 92
 Confession, Sacrament of, 91, 418, 421, 583
 — of Augsburg, *see* Augsburg
 Congregation, Lords of the, 527, 529 ff, 535, 542, 545, 724
 Conn, Papal agent, 344
 Connacht, Bps 625, Cromwell, 626
 Constance, Council of, 46, Indulgences, 59 n, Jesuits, 212, Lutherans, 73, 88, Zwingli, 56, 61 f, 92
 Constans, Emperor, 667
 Constant, Abbé, 445
 Constantine the Great, 664 f
 Constantinople, Caesars, 669 f, 667, Don John, 270, trade, 15
 Constantius, Emperor, 666
Constitutiones Clementinae, ref 689
 Contarini, Gasparo, Venetian Ambassador, 50
 — Cardinal, 174, 180, 402, 457
 Contzen, A., ref 29 n
 Convocation, 133, Acts of, 404 f, 633 f, and Edward VI, 385 ff, 431, 433 ff, and Elizabeth, 467 f, 471 f, Gardiner, 448, and heretics, 409, and Parliament, 389 ff, 394, 396 ff, 400 ff, 405 f, 415 f, 418, 420, 426 f, and Prayer Book, 443, 445
 Cooper, Thomas, Bp of Lincoln, 476
 Cop, Nicholas, and Calvin, 111 f, 236
 Copernicus, and Inquisition, 709, and Paul III, 705
 Corbie, Spaniards at, 309
 Cordier, Mathurin, and Calvin, 107
 Corfu, Don John, 268 f
 Cork, and Elizabeth, 595, Fitzmaurice, 607, Henry VIII, 565, MacCragh, 625, Perrot, 612
 Cornaro, Cardinal, and Ursulines, 176
 Corsica, Cathari, 695, and France, 322
 Cortese, Giegorio, Cardinal, 160, 180 n
 Corunna, Armada, 287
 Cotta, Uisula, and Luther, 32
 Cotton, Père, and Henry IV, 323
 Councils, Lutherans and, 178 ff, 182 f, Scottish, 517 f, *Council of Blood*, 275
 Counter-Reformation, 153 ff, 200 ff
 Court of Augmentations, 378, 466, 473
 — of Arches, 474
 — of Chancery, 398 f, 400, 407, 570, 634, 654
 — of Common Law, 472
 — of Faculties, 474, 581
 — of High Commission, 465, 472, 474, 480, 640, 720
 Courtrai, Beggars, 273
 Coutances, Eudists, 329
 Coutias, battle of, 256

- Coverdale, Miles, 425, 440
 Cowley, Master of the Rolls, 573
 Cox, Richard, Bp of Ely, 466 f
 Cozzano, Gabriel, and Angela Merici, 176
 Cracow, Hosius at, 219
 Craik, Bp of Kildare, 594, 603
 Cramer, J W, ref 119 n
 Cranmer, Thomas, Abp of Canterbury, 130, 161 n, 371, 383 ff, 393 ff, 399 f, 406, 411 ff, 416 f, 419 ff, 424 f, 427 ff, 434 ff, 441, 447 ff, 451 ff, 457 ff, 582 f, and Prayer Book, 219, 436 ff, 444 f, 639
 Creagh, Richard, Abp of Armagh, 598, 601 f, 605, 613
 Crichton, school at, 559
 Crespin, Jean, 113 n, 263
 Crete, Venetians, 267
 Crichton, Fr, S J, in Scotland, 549 f, 552
 Crofts, Sir James, 531 f, 586
 Cromer, George, Abp of Armagh, 579
 Cromwell, Oliver, 347, in Ireland, 626, 722 f
 — Thomas, 366 f, 389 ff, 415 ff, 420, 422, and Bible, 425, and monasteries, 376 f, 380, 385, 390, 396, and Ireland, 567 ff, 571 ff
 Crossraguel, Abbot of, 538, 542, 547
 Cuenca, Molina at, 217
 Cunningham, Fr, O P, 510, 542
 Cupar, Abbey, 529, 557
 Curry, Dr John, 628
 Curwen, Hugh, Abp of Dublin, 590, 592, 594, 596, 601, 621
 Cusack family, and Reformation, 599
 Cyprian, St, al 77
 Cyprus, Turks, 270, Venetians, 267 f
 Czechs, 276, 294 f
 Dalmatia, Turks, 268, Venice, 15
 Damville, in Languedoc, 252, 254 ff
 Daniel, Edmond, S J, 619
 — Terence, and O'Neill, 598
 Danzig, Hansa, 25, 229, 231
 David of Augsburg, Inquisitor, 687.
 Davila, historian, quo 243
 Davis, Miss Jeffries, ref 377
 Dax, St Vincent de Paul at, 326
 Day, Bp of Chichester, and Prayer Book, 436
 'Day of Dupes', 304
 Deer, Abbot of, 538, 547
Defensores Fidei, 294, 297
 Délicieux, Bernard, 690
 Denifle, H S, historian, 68.
 Denmark, 14, religious questions, 97, 228, 332 f, 718 f, Thirty Years' War, 301 ff
 Derry, Bp of, and Elizabeth, 600
 Descartes, al 323
 Desensano, St Angela Merici at, 175
 Desmond, Earls of, and English reformation, 566, 578, 593, 595, 599, 601, 'Desmond Combination', 606 f
 Dessau, battle of, 303, League of, 83, Lutherans, 95
 Deventer, capture of, 282
 Devon, rebels of, 383, 438
 Dieppe, Calvinists, 238, Henry IV, 259
 Dillingen, Jesuits, 212
 Dingle, Fitzmaurice at, 617
 Diodati, John, at Dordrecht, 337 f
 Dionysius the Areopagite, al 103
 Diplomacy, growth of, 6 f, 151 f, 318
 Dispensations, in England, 399, 474, 635
 Disraeli, quo 672
 Dittrich, F, ref 180 n.
 Dixon, Bp of Cork, 610 f
 Dniester, frontier, 13
 Dôle, Richelieu at, 309
 Dollinger, H, ref 673 n
 Dominic, St, and Cathari, 681
 Dominicans, and Inquisition, 682, in Ireland, 618, 620, 624, in Scotland, 125 n, 542, Thomists, 215 f, and usurers, 28, and Zwingli, 55, Third Order, 321
Dominus, Dominee, Scottish, 513 n
 Donatists, 667
 Donauworth, Lutherans, 291, 296
 Donegal, Henry VIII, 565, O'Neill, 600
 Dordrecht, Synod of, 337 f, Union of, 276
 Doria, Andrea, 15
 Dormans, battle of, 253
 Douai, seminary, 137, 205 n, 208 n, 219 f, 222 n, 550
 Douais, Abbé, ref 290, 673 n, 674 n, 687 n, 694
 Douglas, Sir George, 530, 551, and Cardinal Beaton, 500, 517
 Doumergue, E, quo 128 f
 Dowdall, George, Abp of Armagh, 580, 583 ff, 586, 590
 Down, reformation in, 601
 Drake, Sir Francis, 138, 285 f, 289 f, 483
 Dreux, battle of, 246.
 Drogheda, Creagh, 598, Desmond, 600, massacre of, 626, Synod of, 625.
 Drury, Sir William, and O'Hely, 618, in Waterford, 615
 Dryander, Reformer, 434, 438, 441
 Dryden, John, 210 n
 Dublin, Browne, 568, 571 f., Castle,

- 620, Christ Church, 573, 577, Loftus, 601, O'Hurley, 619, Parliament, 578, 593, Prayer Book, 582, 585, 594, Recusancy laws, 594, 596, Remonstrance, 627, St Patrick's, 568 f., 572, 581, 590, 602, 611, 621, Star Chamber, 625, University, 581, 621
- Duchemin, Nic., and Calvin, 107
- Duddeley, Andrew, 498
- Duduk, B., ref 317
- Dumbell, John, vicar of Southcerney, 404
- Dumfries, Catholics, 551
- Dunbar, poet, 509
- Mary of Lorraine at, 529
- Dunblane, Abp of, and Lords, 532, 547
- Dundee, friars, 499, Lords, 528, schools, 509
- Dunfermline, Abbot of, and Lords, 538
- Dunkirk, Farnese at, 281
- Dunstable, Cranmer at, 395
- Duns Scotus, al 217
- Duperre, Cardinal, 221, 223 f., and Henry IV, 260
- Duplessis-Mornay, Philip, 223
- Durham, Bprc of, 363, 381, 443, rebellion, 136
- Dury, Fr John, 510, 551
- Dussileux, L., ref 259 n
- Eberlin, John, Lutheran, 73
- Eboli, princes of, 280
- Ecclesiastical courts, 363 f., 493 f., 502, reservation, 100, 291, 303, 313, residence, 192, revenues, 376, 567, 570, 'ecclesiastical territories', 13, 97 f., 301 ff., and see bishops
- Ecclesiasticus, Valor*, 376, 378
- Eck, John, and Luther, 46 f., 49
- Écouen, Edict of, 240
- Edinburgh, Assembly, 646, Catholics, 542 ff., Parliaments, 644 ff., Presbytery, 539, Reformers, 499, 500, 529, 534, 537, riots, 551, schools, 559, Ursulines, 176
- Edward II, K. of England, and Papal taxation, 364
- IV, K. of England, al 186
- VI, K. of England, 98 n., 128, 161, 416, 422, 427 ff., 446 f., 719, Acts of, 637 ff., and Bishops, 383 f., 414, 420 n., 455, and Bucer, 440, and Bible, 426 f., and heretics, 410 f., and Ireland, 581, 588, 592, and monks, 473, Prayer Book, 385 f., 405 f., 433, 442, 444, and Scotland, 500, 526, and Supremacy, 478 ff., and Uniformity, 379
- Eger, Wallenstein at, 307
- Eglintoun, Earl of, 543
- Egmont, Count of, 271 ff., 275
- Egypt, and Lepanto, 268
- Ehses, Stephan, ref 101, 180 n., 181 n., 183 n.
- Einsiedeln, Zwingli at, 56, 62
- Eisenach, Luther at, 32
- Eisleben, Luther at, 31, 73
- Electors, German, 13 f., 98, 299 f., 304, 311
- Eliot, Sir John, 722
- Elizabeth of France, 240
- Q. of England, 7, 130 f., 132 ff., 347, 389, 400, 460 f., 462 ff., Acts of, 640 ff., 654 ff., and bishops, 385, 402, 406 n., 414 f., 429, 443, 453 n., and France, 246, 248, and heresy, 412, and Ireland, 587, 592 ff., 596 ff., 602 f., 620 ff., 723, and Jesuits, 208, and Netherlands, 275, 279, Pius V, 608, Recusancy laws, 720 f., and schools, 72 n., 98 n., and Scotland, 500, 531 ff., 550 f., 724, and Spain, 283 ff., 608 f.
- Elphinstone, Bp of, and Elizabeth, 600
- Elphinstone, Lord James, 555
- Ely, Bp of, 381, 406, 466 f.
- Emiliano, Girolamo, Oratorians, 158
- Emly, Bp of, and Elizabeth, 595
- Emmerich, Jesuits, 212
- Empire, position of, 9 f., 11, 151, 314 f., and see throughout
- Enders, ref 34 n., 47 n., 54 n., 55 n., 58 n., 91 n., 182 n.
- Engelman, Nicholas, 19
- England, 7 ff., Cathari, 679, Civil Wars, 346 ff., common law, 362 f., free churches, 85 n., Henry IV, 259, Inquisition, 684, 697, James I, 553 f., Jesuits, 208, Don John, 279, League of Cognac, 84, merchants, 24 f., 229, Netherlands, 272, 276, 280, 282, persecution, 718 ff., Philip II, 282 ff., Puritans, 118, 125, 319 f., 339 ff., Reformation in, 353 ff., 127 ff., schools, 72 n., 73, and Scotland, 493 ff., 497 ff., 529 ff., 550, Thirty Years' War, 305, English exiles in Rome, 610 f., 619 ff.
- Englefield, Sir Francis, and Irish cause, 613.
- Enzinas, John, and Inquisition, 705
- Episcopal Registers, 476
- Erasmus, and Bequin, 109, and Bible, 61, 66, 147, and Cambridge, 369, *Colloquia*, 181, and Farel, 114, on Luther, 81 ff., and More, 356, and merchants, 30, and Paris, 108, and Pole, 456 f., and Standonck, 103, and Zwingli, 57, 67.

- Erfurt, 19 f., University of, 32, 34 ff., 73
 Eric, D of Brunswick-Calenberg, 83
 Ermeland, Jesuits in, 332, Bp of, 85,
 219
 Ernest, D of Brunswick-Luneburg, 83,
 88
 — Archduke of Netherlands, 282
 Errol, Earl of, and Jesuits, 551 ff
 Escovedo, murder of, 280
 Essex, Earl of, 339
 Esslingen, Lutherans, 73
 Esterhazy, Count Nicholas, 330 f
 Extremadura, Moriscos at, 266
 Étaples, Lefevre at, 103
 Eucharist, de Berulle on, 326, Calvin
 on, 110, 115, Cranmer, 454 f., Eng-
 lish reformation, 434 ff., 442 ff., 445,
 449, 636, Trent on, 197 f., Real
 Presence, controversy of, 65 f., 67 f.,
 334, 410, 421, 414, 639, 720.
 Eudes, St John, 325, 329
 Eunomeans, 671
 Euric, K of Toulouse, 670
 Eusebius, quo 665 f
 Eustace family, and Reformation, 599
 'Evangelical Union', 296, 298, 300 f
 Eevenin, Abbot, and St Bernard, 679 n
 Evora, Molina at, 217
 Exchequer, English, 378, 472 f
Exsulte Domine, Bull, 49
 Eymeric, Nicolas, Inquisitor, ref 686 n ,
 687 n , quo 688 f., 691, 693
 Faber, Johann, Bp , 62, 64, 67, and
 Paul III, 181
 Faber Stapulensis, *see* Lefèvre
 Fabricius, Secretary of State in Bo-
 hemia, 298
 Faculties, Act of, 574, 654 f., *see* Court of
 Fagius, Paul, Reformer, 441
 Fairfax, Lord, and Charles I, 347 f
 Famagusta, Turks at, 267 f
 Farel, Guillaume, 103 f., 114 f
 Farnese, Alessandro, D of Parma,
 280 ff., and Paris, 260, and England,
 285 ff., 300, and Netherlands, 280 f
 — Alessandro, *see* Paul III
 Fathers of the Church, 59, 210, 212,
 on persecution, 667 f
 Favre, François, and Calvinists, 120
 Favyn, André, ref 250 n , 713
 Felix de Cantalice, St , 161 f
 Felix, Bp of Trier, and Priscillian, 669
 Fénelon, al 330
 Fenouillet, Bp of Montpellier, 325
 Feria, Duchess of, al 132
 Ferdinand I, Emperor, 11, 93, 99, and
 Canisius, 213, and Lutherans, 76,
 Speier, 83 f., 86, and Trent, 189 f.,
 Turks, 84 f
- Ferdinand II, Emperor, 214, 295 ff.,
 307 ff., 317, 330
 — III, Emperor, Thirty Years' War,
 307 f., 310 f
 — the Catholic, K of Spain, 163, and
 Inquisition, 698 ff., 701 f
 — VII, K of Spain, and Inquisition,
 703
 Ferns, Bp of, and Elizabeth, 595
 Ferrara, Inquisition in, 706
 Ferrari, Bartolomeo, 159, 510
 Feu, Scottish, 519, 522
 Feudalism, 17 f., 48, 151
 Fez, Sultan of and Moriscos, 265
 Ficino, Marsighio, and Bible, 146
 Fidelis, St , of Sigmaringen, 162
 Fife, preachers, 497 f., Reformers, 514 f.,
 529
 Financiers, 28, 232, 239, 504
 Finland, and Sweden, 333
 Fintry, laird of, 551
 Fish, Simon, 390
 Fisher, St John, of Rochester, Cardinal,
 128, 149, 356, 367, 395, 400, 413
 — H A L , quo 380
 Fitton, President of Connacht, 610, 612
 Fitzgeralds, *see* Kildare
 Fitzmaurice, James, of Desmond, 606 ff.,
 610 ff., 615 ff., 619
 Flanders, and Elizabeth, 609, and
 France, 322, and Spain, 8 n , 270 ff.,
 274 ff., 281, 306, 321, 610, 616
 Fléchier, Bp , al 330
 Fleix, Treaty of, 254
 Fleglei, ref 25 n
 Fleming, Dr Hay, quo 513, 515, 539 n
 Florence, 15, 318, Bellarmine, 221,
 League of Cognac, 84, Council of, 26,
 187, Galileo, 709 f., Inquisition, 684,
 706, Neri, 202, Ochnio, 161
 Flushing, Leicester at, 285 f
 Fontainebleau, Disputation at, 223
 Fontaine-Française, battle of, 261
 Forbes-Leith, Wm , ref 550 n
 Forrester, James, of Logie, 559
 Forster, F , ref 316
 Forty-two Articles, 445, 467
 Fourier, St Peter, *see* Peter
 Fourquevaux, M de, ambassador, 290
 Fox, King's Almoner, 393
 Foxe, John, 406
 France, 8, 321 f., 379, Albigensians,
 680 ff., Calvinism, 102 ff., 120, 125,
 236 ff., 276, 336, and Empire, 11, 14,
 84, 87 ff., 99, 152 f., 264, and Eng-
 land, 130, 136, 341, Gallicanism,
 363, Inquisition, 696 f., Ireland, 609,
 613, Jesuits, 208, 214, Lutherans, 97,
 710 f., Merchants, 25, 232, Religious
 Wars, 191, 236 ff., 282, 712 f., Revolu-

- tion, al 22, and Scotland, 7, 478, 524, 526 f, 530 ff, 534 ff, Thirty Years' War, 233, 304 ff, 311, 314 ff, and Trent, 191
- Franche-Comté, and France, 309, 322, and Spain, 8, 306, 321
- Francis, D of Brunswick-Luneburg, League of Torgau, 83, and Speier, 88
- I, K of France, 8 f, and Berquin, 109, and Charles V, 12, 47, 74, 97 f, 105, 164, and Clement VII, 179, Lutherans, 113, 236 f, 710 f, Milan, 15 f, and Schmalkaldic League, 94
- II, K of France, Wars of Religion, 242 f
- Borgia, St, 207
- Regis, St, Cevennes, 329
- de Sales, St, 202, 225 f, 322 f, 324 f, and Avellino, 156, and Chablaïs, 222, *Devout Life*, 224, 323, and Ludolph, 164 n, and Maldonado, 218
- Xavier, St, and St Ignatius, 171 f, 207 f, Japan, 198
- Franciscans, 175, 321, 326, 509, English, 370, Irish, 570 f, 607, 610, 617 f, 620, 624, reforms, 160, Scotland, 125 n, theologians, 217, and see Capuchins
- Franconia, 77, witchcraft, 228
- Frankenhausen, battle of, 79
- Frankfort-on-Main, 19, 23, 25 f, English at, 469, Lutherans, 73, 95, Schmalkaldic League, 94, Treaty of, 307
- Franklin, A, ref 126
- Franks, kingdoms, 670
- Frederick II, medieval Emperor, 408, 679, 682
- III, Elector Palatine, 714 f
- V, Elector Palatine, 298 f
- of Saxony, Elector, and Indulgences, 44, Luther, 31, 42, 47 n, 51 f, 74, 85, 183 see Saxony
- Fredericq, Paul, ref 677 n
- Freiburg in Switzerland, 16, Jesuits, 212 f
- Fregoso, Federigo, and Paul III, 180 n
- Friedland, D of, see Wallenstein
- Frisia, 270, Thirty Years' War, 230
- Frith, heretic, 413
- Froben, John, printer, 81
- Froissart, Prieur de, ref 28 n
- Froment, Antoine, at Geneva, 114
- Fronde, war of, 312, 320, 322
- Froschauer, Christopher, printer, 62
- Froude, J. A, quo 131, 506
- Fuentes, Count of, 282
- Fuggers, 12, 25, 29, and Indulgence, 42 ff
- Fulda, Jesuits, 212
- Fuller, quo 222 n, 378
- Gachard, L P, ref 290
- Gaeta, Cajetan, Thomist, in, 215
- Gairdner, ref 382 n, 429 n, 715
- Galicia, Moriscos in, 266
- Galileo, and Inquisition, 709 f
- Galle, Peter, provost of Upsala, 73
- Gallicanism, 191, 214, 319, 363, Bellarmine, 222
- Gallois, on Inquisition, quo 700
- Galloway, Bp of, 522, 536
- Galway, Catholics, 658 f, Tanner, 614
- Garcia, Fray de, O P, 215 n
- Gardiner, Stephen, Bp of Winchester, 371, 387, 387, 391 ff, 428 f, 431 f, 440 f, 444, 447 ff, 460, 469, and Audley, 403, and Bible, 425 f, and Cranmer, 393 f, 456, and Henry VIII, 418, 421 f, and Prayer Book 414 ff, 438
- Garnet, Henry, S J, and James I, 340
- 'Gascoigne, Cadets de', 256
- Gascoigne, Chancellor of Oxford, 368
- Gascony, Cathari, 678
- Gasquet, Cardinal, ref 433 n
- Gebhard, Count of Mansfeld, and League of Torgau, 83
- Geissbussler, Oswald, see Myconius
- Gelderland, revolt, 276, 281, 714
- Gembloix, battle of, 280 f
- Geneva, Bruno, 709, Calvin, 16, 109 f, 112 ff, 117 ff, 125, 139 f, 238, 244 n, 336 ff, 711, 716, Duperron, 223, Francis de Sales, 323
- Genoa and Corsica, 322, and France, 15, merchants, 12 n, 284, Milan, 206, Oratory, 154, and Spain, 331, and Turks, 267 f
- George I, K of England, and Ireland, 659
- II, K of England, and Ireland, 659
- IV, K of England, and Catholic Emancipation, 628
- D of Saxony, Indulgences, 44, 79, 83, and Pack, 86
- Geraldines, 579
- Gerard, Balthasar, 281
- Germany, 8 n, 11, 17, 311, Cathari, 679, 681, and English Reformers, 128, 390, 394, 416 f, 421, 434, 440, 449, Inquisition, 684, 697, 702 f, 714 f, Jesuits, 208 ff, and P of Orange, 274, and Scotland, 493 f, 508, Thirty Years' War, 228 ff, 291 ff, 312 f, Trent, 178 ff, 186 ff, and see Luther
- German College, 200
- Gerson, John, quo. 146, 203 n
- Geyer, Florian, and peasants, 78

- Ghent, Pacification of, 279, Bellarmine, 221
 Ghislieri, Cardinal, 706 f, *see* Pius V
 Giberti, Giammatteo, Bp of Verona, 156 ff, 180 n, 182
 Giles of Viterbo, Augustinian, 35 ff, 159 f
 Giustiniani, Bl Paolo, and Camaldolesse, 159
 Gladstone, al 723
 Glarus, Zwingli at, 56
 Glasgow, Lords of Congregation, 532, 538, Dominicans, 542, Presbyterians, 543, Ogilvie, 218 n
 Gloucester, Bp of, 379, 440
 Goa, Xavier, 209 f
 Goethe, al 78, 233, and Neri, 201
 Gomalz, Andres, Marrano, 699
 Gomarus, Franciscus, 337 f, 339
 Gondi, de, family of, and St Vincent de Paul, 327
 Gondi, Albert de, and Charles IX, 249
 — Jean Francois de, Abp of Paris, 327
 Gondomar, Spanish Ambassador, 341
 Gonsalvez de Camara, Padre, and St Ignatius, 165, 167, 170 n, 171, 177
 Gonzaga, St Aloysius, *see* Aloysius
 — Julia de, 707
 Goodacie, Abp of Armagh, 586, 587
 Gordon, Fr, S J, and James, 549 ff, 552
 Gorkum, Calvinists, 338, massacre, 718
 Goslar, Cathari, 679
 Gotha, Lutherans, 679
 Gothescalch, monk, 670
 Gouda, Arminians, 337
 Grace, doctrine of, 217, 224 f
 Granada, conquest of, 10, Inquisition in, 265 f, 702.
 Granier, Claude de, Bp, 322
 Granvelle, Antoine Perrenot de, Cardinal, 270 ff, 274, 277, 281, 290.
 Gras, M Le, and Marillac, 328
 Gratian, Decree of, 692
 Grattan, Henry, 628
 Gratz, Ferdinand II, 295 f, Jesuits, 212
 Graves, E B, ref 386
 Gray, Irish Lord Deputy, 569, 571 ff, 576 ff
 Greece, Don John, 270
 Greenwood, John, Independent, 487
 Gregory XIII, Pope, Calendar, 213 n, and Elizabeth, 478, Hosius, 219, and Huguenots, 251, and Ireland, 612 f, 615 ff., Maldonado, 218, and Oratory, 203 n, and Propaganda, 162 n. — XV, Pope, 162, 305
 Grimmelhausen, Johann von, satirist, 234.
- Grosseteste, St Robert, *see* Robert
 Grotius, Hugo, 337
 Gruet, Jacques, 120
 Guébriant, General, 309 f
 Guibert de Nogent, quo 677
 Guenne, Huguenots, 251
 Guilds, 21 ff
 Guillaume le Breton, quo 676
 — de Champagne, Abp of Rheims, 678
 — de Paris, 697, *and see* William
 Guillermins, 116
 Guises, 243, 258, 712, and Navarre, 245, 253 ff, 256 f, Religious Wars, 245 ff, 249 f, Cardinal, 256, Mary of Guise, *see* Lorraine
 Gunpowder Plot, 340, 722
 Gustavus I, Vasa, K of Sweden, 14, 73 f, 332, 718 f
 — II, Adolphus, K of Sweden, 305 ff, 316 f, 333
 — III, K of Sweden, 333
 Guttel, Lutheran, 73
 Gutierrez, Fr, S J, and Suarez, 216.
- Haarlem, 270 n
 Haddington, schools, &c, 499, 509
 Hague, Act of Abjuration, 281, Arminians, 337
 Hakluyt's *Voyages*, quo 13 n
 Haguenau, Conference of, 97
 Halberstadt, Administrator, 42, and Brandenburg, 314
 Halkerstoun, provost of Creichton, 559
 Hall, Chronicle, quo 423
 Hall in Swabia, Lutherans, 73
 Halle, Jesuits, 212
 Haller, Berthold, and Zwingli, 61 n
 Hamburg, Lutherans, 73, 85, trade, 229, 231, Treaty of, 310
 Hamilton, Abp of St Andrews, 514, 520, 537
 — Patrick, 723
 — papers, ref 499 n
 Hammond, Dr John, 464
 Hampden Case, 343
 Hampton Court, Conference, 340
 Hannay, R K, ref 548 n
 Hanover, Cathari, 679
 Hanseatic League, 24 f, 229, 231
 Harding, Thomas, and Jewel, 462
 Harduin, Jean, ref 160 n.
 Harnack, quo 53
 Harpsfield, Nicholas, 205 n
 Hausschein, *see* Oecolampadius.
 Haussmann, Nicholas, at Dessau, 95
 Hausrath, ref 35
 Havet, Julien, quo 675
 Hay, George, Presbyter, and Jesuits, 551

- Hazlitt, al 69
 Hay, Fr , S J , in Scotland, 549 f
 — M V , quo 204 n , 205 n
 Heath, Nicholas, Abp of York, 444,
 456, 478 f
 Heierlin, Johann, *see* Faber
 Heidelberg University, 126
 Heilbronn, Assembly of, 307, and
 Speier, 88
 Heiligenstadt, Jesuits, 212
 Helmstadt, Lutherans, 709
 Hely, Fr , in Rome, 613 f
 Henri, Catharist, 674
 Henrietta Maria, Q of Charles I, 341,
 344
 Henry, D of Brunswick-Wolfenbuttel,
 83, 96
 — III, Emperor, and Cathari, 679
 — II, K of England, and Cathari, 679,
 682, in Ireland, 565, 570, 577, 578 n
 — IV, K of England, and heretics,
 409 ff , 412 n
 — V, K of England, heresy laws,
 409 ff , 634
 — VI, K of England, Statutes, 378
 — VII, K of England, 7, 473, 719 f .
 — VIII, K of England, 7 f , 16, 98,
 126 ff , 132 f , 354–432, 465 f , Acts
 of, 633 f , 640, 651 f , and continuity,
 453, and Cranmer, 455, and divorce,
 391 ff , and Gardiner, 448 f , and
 heretics, 409 ff , and monasteries,
 376 ff , 384 f , and Pole, 456 ff , and
 Countess of Salisbury, 186, schools,
 72 n , in Ireland, 565 ff , 574 ff , 582,
 592, 620, in Scotland, 456, 493 f ,
 500, 530, 723
 — II, K of France, 223, 238 ff , and
 Protestants, 120, and Saxony, 99
 — III, K of France, 248 ff , 251 ff ,
 255 ff , and Duperion, 223
 — IV, K of France, 143, 252, 254,
 713 f , and Bellarmine, 222, and
 Duperron, 223, and Farnese, 282
 — D of Guise, and League, 253 ff
 — Count of Nassau, 277
 — Prince of Wales, s of James I, 341
 — of Kettenbach, Lutheran, 73
 Heresy, English Acts, 634, 638, 655,
 Inquisition, 686 ff , trials, 666 ff ,
 English trials, 371 f , 385, 401, 408 f ,
 427, 459 f , 469 f , 477, Scottish, 511,
 514, 516 f
 Herbert, Abp of Milan, 678.
 Hermans, Jacob, *see* Arminius
 Hermann of Wied, Abp of Cologne,
 435.
 Hermannus Contractus, chronicler, 679
 Hermundard, A L , ref 66, 107 n ,
 109 n , 110 n , 113 n , 126 n , 147
 Hernando of Cordova, Morisco, 265
 Hertford, Earl of, 499
 Hesse, Ritterschaf, 77, Hesse-Cassel,
 Calvinists, 334, Hesse Darmstadt,
 Landgrave of, 308
 Heylyn, Peter, quo 404
 Hildegarde, St , quo. 677
 Hinds, A B , ref 290
 Hobbes, Robert, Abbot of Woburn, 382
 Hobey, Sir Thomas, quo 129
 Hohenzollerns, 13, 42 ff
 Holland, independence of, 276, 278 f ,
 281 f , 320, Reformers, 270, 337,
 Richelieu, 305, 308 f , and Spain,
 312, trade, 229, 232
 Holmquist, Hjalmar, ref 74
 Holstein, Duchy of, 303
 Holyrood, Mary Stuart, 542.
 Homberg, Synod of, 85
 Homilies, Book of, 426, 430 f
 Honorius, Emperor, and heretics, 667
 Hooker, Richard, 235, 402, 408 f , 419,
 483
 Hooper, Bp , 404, 414, 426, 432 f , 440,
 442 ff
 — Wilfred, ref 474 n
 Hoorne, Count, 273, 275
 de l'Hôpital, Michel de, Chancellor, 245
 Horn, Swedish General, 307
 Hosius, Cardinal, 219, 221, 332
 Hospitals, medieval, 41 n , 483
 Hotman, Francis, 243
 Howard of Effingham, Lord, 287 f
 — Sir George, in Scotland, 534
 Howth, Lord, 588
 Hubmaier, Balthasar, and peasants, 78
 Huguenots, 120, 122, 223, 241 ff , 304,
 322, 711 f , 715, and Scots, 534
 Hugues, Bp of Auxerre, and Cathari, 678
 Huillard-Breholles, ref 409
 Hull, Charles I, 346
 Humanists, and Bible, 145 f , 151 , and
 Luther, 47, 77, 81 ff , Lefèvre, 103,
 Zwingli, 54, 57 f
 Humboldt, al 233
 Hume, Martin A S 290 n
Hundred Complaints, 75
 Hundred Years' War, 128
 Hungary, 11, Calvinism, 292 ff ,
 Catholicism, 330, Ferdinand II, 296,
 Inquisition, 684, Kings of, 84 f ,
 Turks, 162
 Hunne, Richard, 390
 Hunt, J. H. , ref 69
 Huntly, Earl of, 530, 534, 545, and
 James, 552 f
 Huss, John, al 46, 150, 297 n .
 Hutten, Ulrich von, and Luther, 47.
 Hyde, Sir Edward, and Charles I, 346
 Iceland, Lutherans, 97

- Ignatius of Antioch, St., and Loyola, 163
 — Loyola, St., 108, 162 ff., 167 ff., 170, 173, 176 ff., 195, 200 ff., 207, 210, and Canisius, 211 f.
- Illyricus, Flacius, and *Centuries*, 205 n., and Melanchthon, 334 f.
- Imitation of Christ*, 168, 203.
- Independents, 347
- Index, of Paul IV, 189, 707
- Indies, 11, 26, 209 f.
- Indulgences, 39 f., 41 ff., 54, 56, 59, 61, 82, 150, 153, 190
- Infralapsarians, 336
- Flugo, St., 163
- Ingolstadt, Eck at, 46, Jesuits, 212, 217, 295, Staphylus, 221
- Innocent II, Pope, and heretics, 678
 — III, Pope, and Cathari, 681 ff., 687, 693
 — IV, Pope, and Inquisition, 691
 — X, Pope, and Westphalia, 316 f.
- Innsbruck, Jesuits, 212
- Inquisition, 673 n., 674 n., 682 ff., 704 ff., Calvin, 121, France, 238, Ignatius, 170 f., Netherlands, 271 ff., 717, Ochino, 161, Spain, 264, 321, 698 ff.
- Interest, 27 f., 30
- Investitures, quarrel of, 318
- Ionian Is. Turks, 268, and Venice, 15
- Ireland, Armada, 289, *Book out of*, 585, Calendar of Decrees, 651 ff., Captainries, 605 f., Charles I, 345, language, 575, 584, 611, Reformation in, 565 ff., 723, and Spain, 138
- Irish Ecclesiastical Review*, ref 578 n.
- Isabella of Austria, 76
 — Q. of Spain, and Inquisition, 698 f., 701
- Isny, and Speier, 88
- Istria, and Venice, 15
- Italy, 14 f., 58, 150, 178 f., Cathari, 674, 678, 695, Inquisition, 697, 704 f., merchants, 25, Reformation, 200 ff., Scots, 510
- Ithacius, Bp., and Priscillian, 668 f.
- Ivry, battle of, 259 f.
- Jacobites, and penal laws, 722
- Jagellons, 14, 332, Katharine, Q. of Sweden, 719
- James I, K. of England, 27, 298, 319, 548, 553, 647 ff., and Bellarmine, 222, and Convocation, 467 f., and heretics, 412, 722, and Ireland, 624, 655, and Jesuits, 550 ff., and Puritans, 339 f., and Recusancy laws, 643, and Spain, 290
 — II, K. of England, and Ireland, 627 f., 656 f., and Scotland, 724
- James V, K. of Scotland, 494 ff., 497 f., 501 f., 504, 507, 515, 521, 523, 525, 535, 723
 — VI, K. of Scotland, *see* James I of England
- Jan of Leyden, 96
- Janelle, Pierre, ref 450 n.
- Janssen, Johannes, ref 30 n., 35 n., 68, 71 n.
- Jansen, Bp., uncle of Jansenius, 221
- Jansenius, Bp. of Ypres, 221, Jansenists, 221 f., 319
- January Edict, 245, 248
- Japan, St. Francis Xavier, 198, 209 f.
- Jarnac, battle of, 248, 252.
- Jeanne de Chantal, St., 324
- Jellicoe, Admiral, al 286
- Jendin, H., 36 n.
- Jerome, St., quo 666, al 77, 103, 187.
- Jerusalem, pilgrims, 170 f., 176
- Jesuits, 155, 162 ff., 173 ff., 200 ff., 207 ff., 705, Bohemia, 293, 298, 302, 330, and Emperors, 206, 293 ff., in England, 137, 478 f., 642, 721, in France, 236, 250, 323, in Germany, 208 ff., 234, in Ireland, 579 f., 614, 618, 620, 624, 627, in Poland, 332, in Scotland, 544, 549 ff., 555, 649 ff., in Spain, 321, in Sweden, 333, *Spiritual Exercises*, 208, 210, 224, theologians, 216 f., 221 f.
- Jewel, Bp., 385, 462
- Jews, Inquisition, 689 f., 698, 707, money-lending, 28, 229, Poland, 14
- Joachim of Brandenburg, 83
- Joan of Arc, St., and Inquisition, 697
- John, St., quo 143 n.
- John of Austria, Don, and England, 285, Lepanto, 268 ff., Morisco, 266, Netherlands, 279 ff., and Stucley, 610
- John of Bourbon, and Cluny, 380
- John Berchmans, St., 207.
 — Chrysostom, St., on heretics, 667, 669, al 77, 103
 — of the Cross, St., 224, 225
 — Damascene, St., 103
 — Fisher of Rochester, St., *see* Fisher
 — K. of England, al 396
 — III, K. of Portugal, and Xavier, 209
 — of Saxony, Elector, 54, 79, 83, 88, 299
 — III, K. of Sweden, 332 f., 719
 — Frederick of Wemar, 228
 — John of St. Thomas, O.P., 215
- Johnstown, Adam, 559
 — John, 559
- Jonville, Pact of, 254
- Jonas, Justus, 183, 185
- Joseph of Arimathea, St., 485

- Joseph of Leonissa, St., Capuchin, 162
 — Père, and Richelieu, 306
 Josephists, al 222, 319
 Joyeuse, favourite of Henry III, 256
 Jud, Leo, and Wytenbach, 56, and Zwingli, 61 ff
 Julian the Apostate, Emperor, 667
 Julius II, Pope, 201
 — III, Pope, and Inquisition, 705 f, and Trent, 186, 188 f
 July Edict, 256
 Justices, English, 420, 438, 636, 641, Irish, 657, 660
 Justification, doctrine of, 35 ff, 57, 65 f, 143, 160, 510, 524 f, Calvin, 112, 117 f, Erasmus, 81, Melanchthon, 90 f, 334, Pole, 457, Trent, 188, 194 ff
 Justin, St., al 665
 Jutland, Wallenstein, 303
 Kaisersberg, Geiler von, 27, 29
 Kalkoff, quo 47 n.
 Kamin, Bprc of, 314
 Kant, al 233
 Kantzow, quo 17
 Kappell, battle of, 94
 Kempen, Stephen, Lutheran, 73
 Kempten, town of, 88
 Kene, Richard, 559
 Kennedy, Quenin, Abbot of Crossraguel, 510, 512, 542
 — W P, ref 129 n
 Keogh, John, 628
 Kessler, John, chronicle of, 46
 Kidd, B J, ref 74 n, 75 n, 76 n, 85 n, 99 n, 101, 180 n
 Kidderminster, Richard of Winchcombe, 370, 380.
 Kildare, 565, Bprc of, 593, 595; Earls of, 566 f See Desmond, Fitzgerald
 Kilkenny, Bale at, 587 ff, Synod of, 625
 Killin, school, 559
 Kilmainham, Hospitallers, 574, 590
 Kilmallock, Bp O'Hely at, 619
 King's Book, 422, 426
 Kinloquhy, Dean Patrick, 537
 Kinloss Abbey, 510, 557
 Kinsale, battle of, 622
 Kirknewton, school, 559
 Klostergrab, Utraquists, 297
 Knollys, Sir Francis, and Burghley, 464 n
 Knox, John, al 385, 414, 495, 497, 499 f, 512, 514, 516, 526 ff, 529, 531 ff, 535, 538 f, 547, 558, 723 f, and Beggars, 546, and Calvinists, 125, chalice question, 443 f, Cranmer, 454
 Koch, Anni, quo 47 n
 Königsberg, Lutherans, 73, Staphylus, 220
 Königsbrück, book of, 19
 Kopfli, Wolfgang, see Capito
 Kottbus, Lutherans, 73
 Kulm, Hosius in, 219
 Kuppner, Christopher, 28
 Kurschner, Conrad, and Wytenbach, 56
 Labbe, P, ref 687, 692
 La Flèche, College of, 323
 Lalor, Robert, Vicar-General of Dublin, 625
 La Louvesc, Regis at, 329
 Lambe, Robert, Reformer, 499
 Lambert, François, Reformer, 85 — W A, ref 69
 Lambeth, Reformers at, 441, 468
 Lamoral, Ct of Egmont, see Egmont.
 Lamormaini, Wilhelm, S J, ref 317
 Landenberg, Hugo von, Bp of Constance, 62
 Landstuhl, Sickingen at, 77
 Landau, apothecary, and Luther, 185
 Landes, St Vincent de Paul, 326
 Landulphus, ref 678 n
 Lang, Andrew, quo 126
 — John, and Luther, 149, 73
 Langenburg, festival of, 18
 Langenstein, Heinrich von, 29
 Languedoc, Cathari, 674, 680, Damville, 254, Huguenots, 250 f
 Laon, Henry IV, 261
 Lapide, Cornelius a, S J, 218
 La Place, historian, quo 243 n
 La Popelinière, historian, quo 243 n
 La Rochelle, Huguenots, 238, 242, 304, and Elizabeth, 251, Edict of, 251, ships, 284
 Laski, John, Reformer, 126, 457 n
 Lateran Councils, 153, 160, 181, 677, 680
 Latimer, Bp, 130, 385 f, 413, 421, 440, 446, 449, 456, and Bps' Book, 418, and Bilney, 371, and monks, 376, 379, 381, 383, and new learning, 368, and Parliament, 388, and Pole, 458, and de Soto, 215 n
 Latin Empire, Don John, 270
 Latium, Papal State, 331
 Laud, Wm, Abp of Canterbury, 343 ff, al 404, 466
 Launceston, Cuthbert Mayne, 136
 Laurence of Brindisi, St, 162, 217
 — R V, quo 204 n
 Lautrec, Amiel de, and Inquisition, 697.
 Lavedan, Henri, ref 326 n.
 Lavaur, massacre of, 682.

- Law, canon, 399 f., 406 ff., 409, 412 n., common law, 362 ff., 407, 465
 Laws, English, 633 ff.
 Lawyers, English, 407, 465 f., 637, Irish, 596, medieval, 693, of Paris, 257, Scottish, 510
 Laynez, Diego, S J., 171, 187, 216 f., 241
 Lea, H C., quo 674 n., 677 n., 681 n., 687 n., 690 n., 691, 693, 699
 Leach, A F., ref 129 n.
 Lecce, ref 17 n.
 Le Croisic, Calvinists at, 238
 Lecky, W., quo 715
 Lectoure, Huguenots in, 262
 Lefèvre, Jacques d'Étaples, 66, 102 ff., 109, 112, 146 f., 710
 Le Fèvre, Pierre, *see* Peter Faber, St
 Leicester, Earl of, 285, 603
 Leinster, Bps of, 592, 625
 Leipzig, deputation of, 46, Gustavus, 306, Luther, 98, Philippists, 334
 Leith, Lords of Congregation, 533
 Le Jay, Claude, S J., 172, 211
 Lejeune, Père, 329
 Lennox, Earl of, 548, 550 f.
 Lens, battle of, 310
 Leo I, Pope St., on heretics, 669
 — X, Pope, death, 74, and humanists, 66 n., 146 f., Indulgences, 41, Luther, 50, 704, Oratory, 154 n.
 Leon, Moriscos, 266
 Leonard, Fr., C M., ref 326 n.
 Lepanto, 266, 268 f., 281, 285 n., Stucley, 610
 Le Plat, J., ref 199
 Leslie, John, Reformer, 495
 Lessius, Leonard, S J., 216
 Lestonnac, Jeanne de, 324
 Leube, Hans, ref 483 n.
 Leverous, Bp of Kildare, 590, 593
 Lewis, Dr., and Ireland, 613
 Leyden, Arminius, 336 f., siege of, 278
 Liberius, Pope, 667
Licet ab Intio, Bull, 705
Licet ex omnibus, Bull, 691
 Licinius, Emperor, 664
 Lieb, Kilian, quo 28
 Liège, Cathari, 676, 677
 Limerick, Battle of, 628, Catholics, 658, Perrot, 612, Treaty of, 628, 656
 Linacre, Thomas, and Pole, 456
 Lincoln, Bp Cooper, 476
 Lincolnshire, Pilgrimage of Grace, 379
 Lindau, town of, 88, 92
 Lindsay of Pitscottie, 495
 Langard, John, ref 131 n., 134 n.
 Link, Wenzel, Lutheran Reformer, 73.
 Linlithgow, Winzet at, 536 f.
 Lippomano, Luigi, Papal Legate, 332
 Lisbon, English, 289 f., Irish, 616 f., merchants, 26, Molina, 217, Santa Cruz, 285
 Lisieux, Huguenots, 250 n.
 Lismannini, Francisco, Reformer, 126
 Lismore, Bp of, 595
 Lithuania, and Poland, 13
Litterae Majestaticae, 294, 297
 Llorente, Juan Antonio, 700 f.
 Locke, al 709
 Loeb, Isidore, quo 690
 Loftus, Adam, Bp of Armagh, 593 f., 596, 598 f., 601 ff., 611, 621
 Logie, school in, 559
 Lollardy, 147, 359, 368, 409
 Lomas, S C., ref 290
 Lombard Law, 679
 — Peter, Abp of Armagh, 621 f., 625
 Lombardy, Iron Crown of, 89
 London, Austin Canons, 377, Essex, 339, Great Fire, 404, Hansa, 24, preachers, 390, Puritans, 603, St Paul's, 442
 Longjumeau, peace of, 248
 Longville, D of, 259 n.
 Lorraine, Cardinal of, 238, 244, 712, Fourier, 325, and France, 8 n., 322, Mary of, Regent of Scotland, 507, 523, 528, 531, 533 f., 724
 Loudun, Calvinists, 238
 Louis, D of Bavaria, and Indulgences, 44
 — Count Palatine of the Rhine, 313 f.
 — VII, K of France, and Albigenses, 680 ff., and Alexander III, 677
 — XII, K of France, and Milan, 15, al 8, 113
 — XIV, K of France, *Chambers of Reunion*, 315, and Nantes, 261, 714, al 8 n., 311, 321
 — II, K of Hungary and Bohemia, 11, 84 f.
 — Ct of Nassau, 272 f., 275 f., and see Luis
 Louisa of Savoy, and Berquin, 109
 Louvain, capture of, 281, Jesuits, 216, 218, 221, 550, Stapleton, 219 f.
 Lovers' War, 253 f.
 Loyola, Bertram de, 163
 — St Ignatius, *see* Ignatius
 Lubeck, 23, Anabaptists, 96, Hansa, 25, Lutherans, 85, trade, 229, 231
 Lucca, Inquisition, 707
 Lucerne, Catholicism, 336, Jesuits, 212.
 Lucius III, Pope, and Albigensians, 680
 Ludolph of Saxony, Carthusian, 164 f., 168
 Lugo, P de, theologian, 321.
 Luis of Granada, 224

- Lupulus, *see* Wolfen
 Lusatia, and Saxony, 299 f
 Lunt, Prof W E, ref 364 n
 Luther, Hans, 31 f
 — Martin, 30 ff, 41 ff, 46 ff, 90 ff, 98, 140 ff, 144 ff, 185, 189, 233, 334, 524 f, and Cajetan, 215, and Calvin, 107, 110 f, 114 f, 124 f, and Counter-Reformation, 158, 163, 165, 167 f, 170, 175, 202, 213, and Papacy, 319, and peasants, 79 f, and Philip of Hesse, 85, 97, and Ritterschaft, 77, at Rome, 159 f, Schmalkaldic League, 94 ff, and Sorbonne, 109, and Trent, 178 f, 182 ff, 194 ff, and Zwingli, 57 f, 60, 64 ff, 67 f, 88 f
 — Martin, works of, 68 f, 70 f, *On Christian Schools*, 72 n, *Consolations of a Christian Soul*, 111, *Appeal to the Christian Nobility*, 47, 49, 178, *Prelude to the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*, 48, 49, *Instructions concerning the Visitation of Churches*, 54, *The Liberty of a Christian Man*, 48, *On the Bondage of the Will*, 39, 80, *On the Claims of the Peasantry*, 72 n, *Against the Peasantry*, 72 n, 80, *Appeal from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope better-informed*, 45, 178, *Of Secular Authority*, 72 n, *Table-Talk*, 32, 34 n, 68 f, *German Theology*, 41, *Commentary on Galatians*, 40, *on the Psalms*, 37, *on Romans*, 37 f
 — Paul, 35
 Lutheranism, growth of, 11, 13, 14, 52 ff, 70 ff, 144 ff, 193, 311, 313, 334 f, 525, 714 f, in Bohemia, 330, in England, 127, 357, 359 f, 416 ff, 463, 719, and Ferdinand II, 295 f, 299, in France, 104 ff, 109, 111, 113, 236, 239, 710, in Italy, 200, 704, Poland, 332, Scandinavia, 332 f, 718 f, Scotland, 497, 521, 723, Thirty Years' War, 291 ff
 Lutter, battle of, 303
 Lutzen, battle of, 307
 Luxembourg, Don John, 279 f, Gustavus, 306
 Lynch, James, Abp of Tuam, 627
 Lyndsay, David, playwright, 507 ff
 Lyonnais, Huguenots, 247
 Lyons, bankers, 239, Inquisition, 716, merchants, 12 n, Protestants, 242
 Maas R, Beggars, 276
 Macaulay, quo 154 n, 163, 227, 259 n, al 682
 MacBrien, Bp of Emly, 613, 619
 MacCaghwell, James, Abp of Cashel, 605
 MacCragh, Dermot, Abp of Cork, 625
 MacDonells, and O'Neill, 600
 McGauran, Bp of Armagh, 619
 MacGibbon, Abp of Cashel, 605, 607 ff, 611 f, 619
 Machiavelli, Niccolò, 6, 257 n
 Maçon, Pastor, and Calvin, 238
 McWhirrie, Fr, on James I, 553
 Madrid, Habsburgs, 304, Jesuits, 177, 217
 Madruzzo, Cardinal, 186, 190
 Maestricht, siege of, 279, 281
 Magdeburg, bishopric, 42, 291, and Brandenburg, 314, *Centuries*, 204 f, and Luther, 32, 73, 83
 Magrath, Meiler, Bp of Down, 601, 610, 623
 Maguire of Fermanagh, 601
 Maillet-Hanquet, ref 666 n, 672
 Mainz, Abp of, 13, 19 f, 98, and Gustavus, 306, 308, and Indulgences, 42 ff, and Jesuits, 212, and Leo X, 50
 Maitland Club, 559 n
 — S R, quo 363, 412 n
 — William of Lethington, 534, 547 f
 Malacca, Xavier, 209 f
 Maluccas, Xavier, 209 f
 Malcontents, 251
 Maldonado, Juan, S J, 217 f
 Malines, capture of, 281, Granvelle, 272, Revolt, 273
 Malta, Turks, 266 f
 Manassar, Xavier, 209
 Manichaeans, 668, 671 f
 Mannheim, Gustavus, 306
 Manning, Cardinal, al 479
 Manor Rights, 17 f.
 Manresa, Ignatius, 165 ff
 Mansi, ref 676 n, 678 n, 684 n
 Mansfeld, Counts of, 83, 282, 300, 303, Luther at, 31 f
 — Agnes von, 291
 Mant, R, quo 587
 Mantua, 331, and France, 304, 309.
 Manzoni, novelist, ref 206
 Marburg, Luther, 88 f, 93, University of, 85
 Marcellus II, Pope, and Bellarmine, 221, Trent, 189 f
 Maick, de la, William, 717 f
 Marcourt, Antoine, and Placards, 113.
 Marennes, Calvinists, 238
 Margaret of Angoulême, and Meaux, 105 f
 — of Austria, and Charles V, 12
 — Duchess of Parma, in Netherlands, 270 f, 272 ff
 — Q of Navarre, 236
 — Q of Navarre (2), 254.

- Margaret of Salisbury, Bl., 186, 456 f
 Margate, Armada, 288
 Mariana, quo 700 f
 Mariejol, quo 242, 250 n
 Marignano, battle of, 15, 56
 Marillac, Louise de, 328
 Maritain, Jacques, 224
 Marlowe, Christopher, 243 n
 Marot, Clément, 119 f., 239
 Marprelate Tracts, 339, 487 n
 Marr, Earl of, 551, and MacGibbon, 611
 Marranos, 698 f., 702, 707
 Marriage, recusancy laws, 658 f., Scottish, 502, 540, Trent, 190
 Marshall, William, 397
 Marsighio of Padua, 397
 Martene, Edmund, ref 677 n
 Marthaler, Caspar, ref 55 n
 Martin of Tours, St., 669
 Martinitz, Governor of Bohemia, 297 f
 Marquemont, Mgr de, Abp of Lyons, 324
 Mary of the Incarnation, Bl., 324
 — Tudor, Q. of England, 129 f., 134, 161 n., 246, 385, 412 ff., 439, 446 f., 451, 472, 720, 724, Acts of, 639 ff., and Cranmer, 455, and Ireland, 583 ff., monasteries, 641, and Philip, 283, and Somerset, 430, 432, and Supremacy, 465, Marian priests, 136, 219
 — of Lorraine, see Lorraine
 — Q. of Scots, 537, 542 ff., 545, 548, 723 f., and Elizabeth, 132, 135, 284, 533 f., execution of, 137 f., 233, 290, 478, 551, and Francis II, 243 f., and Don John, 279, and Mary of Lorraine, 523, and Stucley, 613
 Mass, and Reformers, 52, 84, 64 f., 86, 113 f., 198, in England, 132, 134 f., 137, 219, 371, 385, 413, 421, 642, in Scotland, 498, 503, 507, 528 f., 542 f., 554, Acts against, 638 ff., 645 ff., 649, Mass-houses, 599
 Massillon, Jean Baptiste, al 330
 Mathew, Fr David, ref 481 n
 Matthew, St., Zwingli on, 59
 Matthews, Abp of Dublin, 625
 Matthias, Emperor, 293 f., 296 f
 Matthieu, Pierre, and Henry IV, 255.
 Maunoir, Ven Julien, S J., 329
 Maurevel, assassin, 249
 Maurice of Nassau, 282, 336 f
 — Elector of Saxony, and Charles V, 98 f
 Maximilian, D. of Bavaria, 214, 295 f., 299 f., 302, 305
 Maximianists, 667
 Maximilian I, Emperor, 11, 47, 49
 — II, Emperor, 211, 292 f., al 295, and Netherlands, 275, and Trent, 190 f
 Maximus, Roman Emperor, 669
 Maxwell, Lord, in Dumfries, 551
 — controversialist, 510, 542
 Mayenne, D. of, 257, 259 ff
 Mayne, Bl Cuthbert, 136
 Mazarin, Cardinal, 314 f., 319, al 311
 Mazurier, Martial, 104
 Meath, Reformation in, 565, 573, 593 ff., 615
 Meaux group, 102 ff., 106, 109, 236, 238
 Mecklenburg, Wallenstein at, 303
 Medici, family of, 15, 331, Catherine de, Q. of France, 244 ff., 248 ff., 255 ff., 263, 712 f., and Ireland, 609, and Inquisition, 707 ff., Giovanni, Angelo de', 189, 205, *see* Pius IV, Giulio, Cardinal de, 75, 156, *see* Clement VII, Marie de, al 329
 Medina Sidonia, D. of, and Armada, 286 f., 290
 Mediterranean, Turks in, 264
 Melanchthon, Philip, 46, 52, 58, 68, 148, 163, 182, 195, 334 f., and Augsburg, 90 ff., and Calvin, 717, and England, 417, 435, 455; and Francis I, 710, and Philip of Hesse, 97, and Tient, 189
 Melito of Sardis, St., 665
 Melrose Abbey, 510, 557
 Melville, Andrew, 126
 Memmingen, town of, 88, 92
 Menchinger, Manor Laws, 18
 Mendoza, Don Bernardino de, 290
 'Menippean Satire', 260, 263
 Merchants, 6, 8, 10, 12 ff., 24 ff., 229, 231
 Mercœurs family, and Francis of Sales, 323
 Merici, de, *see* St Angela
 Merindol, Waldenses in, 237
 Merkle, Sebastian, ref 199
 Merovingians, 670
 Merseburg, Bprc of, 291.
 Messina, Canisius, 211
 Methuen, Reformer, 512, 514.
 Metz, Farel, 115, and France, 315, and Saxony, 99
 Meyer, A O., quo 479 n., 481 n., 133.
 — Conrad, on Fuggers, 29
 — Hans of Knonau, 63
 Michelangelo, and Popes, 201.
 Michlet, J., ref 69
 Middelburg, capture of, 277
 Middleton, E., ref 69
 Midi, Cathari, 674
 Migne, J P., ref 674 n

- Milan, Ambassador of, 386, Barnabites, 159, Borromeo at, 205, Cathari, 678, Charles V, 89, League of Cognac, 84, Edict of, 664 f., Francis I, 15, Inquisition in, 684, 705, 707, Lutherans, 704, and Spain, 321
 Millau, Huguenots, 251
 Miln, Reformer, 512, 514
 Milton, quo 237
 Minden, Bprc of, 291, and Blandenburg, 314
 Mines, medieval, 21 f., 232
 Mirandola, Pico della, and Bible, 146
 Mission, Priests of the, 327 f.
 Modena, Duchy of, 331, and France, 309, and Inquisition, 706 f.
 Moderators, Scottish, 553 f.
 Mohacz, battle of, 11, 84 f., 266
 Mohammedans and Spain, 264 ff., 698, 702, *see* Moriscos
 Moller, Heinrich, 73
 Molina, Luis, S J., 217
 Molinists, 338
 Molinos, Miguel de, Quietist, 710
 Molsheim, Jesuits, 212
 Mombaer, Abbot of Livry, 103, 153
 Monarchy, theories of, 6, 8, 93, 128, 151, 222, 296, 319, 353, 388 f., 403 f., 465 f., 495 f., 504, 683, 710, 714, and Charles I, 342, 344 ff., and Gardiner, 450, and Cardinal Pole, 458, *see* Supremacy, Royal, in Poland, 14, in Scotland, 501 f.
 Monasteries, 21, 52, 71, 91, 155, and Lutherans, 84, 86, 114, English, 127, 355 ff., 359, 373 ff., 382 f., 415, 438 f., 472 f., 568, 635 f., 645, 719, Irish, 569 f., 575 f., 620, 654, Scottish, 494 ff., 497 f., 505 ff., 510 ff., 513, 515, 527 f., 557
 Mondejar, Marquis of, and Moriscos, 265 f.
 Mondovi in Piedmont, Bellarmine, 221
 Mons, Louis of Nassau, 276
 'Monsieur, Peace of', 252, Monsieur, title of, 252 n.
 Montague, Lord, and Supremacy, 134
 Montaigne, al 324
 Montanists, 671
 Montargis, Calvinists in, 238
 Montauban, Protestants, 125, 251
 Montcontour, battle of, 248
 Monle, Giovanni Maria del, *see* Julius III
 — Corona, monastery, 159
 Monteferrat, duchy of, 304
 Monteforte in Piedmont, Cathari, 678
 Montepulciano, Bellarmine at, 221.
 Monterey, Suarez in, 216.
 Montesquieu, Captain, 248
 Montfort, de, Simon the elder, 681 f.
 Montigny, Count, in Netherlands, 273
 Montgomery, Gabriel de, and Henry II, 240
 Montluc, condottiere, 247
 — Blaise de, quo 253, 263
 Montmartre, St Ignatius, 171
 Montmor, family of, 107
 Montmorency, Anne de, 252, Montmorencies, 240, 243 ff., 248
 Montorio, Pietro Cardinal, and St Vincent de Paul, 326
 Montpellier, Bp of, 325, Protestants, 125, 262
 Montrose, Earl of, 555
 Montserrat, shrine of, 165
 Mooker Heide, battle, 277
 Moors, and Spain, 10, 698, *see* Moriscos
 Moravia, Protestants, 292 f., 332, Thirty Years' War, 230
 Moray, Bp of, and Lords, 536
 More, Alice, 359
 — St Thomas, *see* Thomas
 Moriarty, Bernard, Vicar-General of Dublin, 625
 Morigia, Jacopo, and Zaccaria, 159
 Moriscos, suppression of, 264 ff., 698
 Morlas, Calvinist, and Henry IV, 260
 Morocco, and Spain, 321, 698
 Morone, Giovanni Cardinal, and Paul IV, 706, Trent, 190
 Morton, Earl of, 548 f.
 Moschersoch, satirist, 234
 Moscow, Court of, 13
 Moslems, *see* Mohammedans
 Mountgarret, Lord, 588
 Mozarabic rite, al 434
 Muhlberg, battle of, 98, 188, 274
 Muller, Hans, of Bulgenbach, 78
 Muller, Henry, quo 20
 Munich, Ferdinand II, 299, Jesuits, 212
 Munro, Alexander, 559
 Munster, Bps of, 574, 592, 625, Jesuits, 614, rebellion, 606, Sydney, 601
 Munster, Anabaptists, 272, Jesuits, 212, Treaty of, 310 f.
 Munzer, Jerome, quo 25
 Munzer, Thomas, 53, 78 f., 96
 Muratori, L A, ref 678 n
 Murray, Earl of, 545, 548 f., *see* Stuart, Lord James
 Muret, battle of, 682
 Mutianus Rufus, at Erfurt, 33
 Myconius, Oswald, 57, 73
 Mystery Plays, Irish, 589
 Mysticism, 166 f., 224 ff.
 Najera, D de, and Ignatius, 164
 Nangle, Richard, Augustinian, 573

- Nantes, Edict of, 261 f, 322, 713 f
 Naples, 14 f, 321, Inquisition in, 697, 704 f
 Napoleon, Emperor, and Inquisition, 703
 Narbonne, and Alexander II, 676
 Nassau, Lutherans, 95, Counts of, 272 f, 275 ff, *see* Henry, Louis, Maurice, William, and *see* Orange
 Nationalism, 6, 14, 149, 194, 304 f, 401, 503
 Naumburg, Bprc of, 291
 Navara, battle of, 56
 Navarre, Kingdom of, 8 n, *see* Anthony of Bourbon, Henry IV of France
 Neilston, Presbyterians, 543 f
 Neisse, witches in, 234
 Nemours, Edict of, 255
 Nemours, family of, 323
 Nerac, Calvinists, 238
 Neri, Francesco, 202
 — St Philip, *see* Philip
 Netherlands, Calvinists in, 126, 270 ff, 321, 336, and England, 138, 284 f, 289, and France, 254, 305, 310, Inquisition, 684, 717 f, Merchants, 25, and Spain, 8 n, 11, 247 f, 260, 264 ff, 270 ff, 298
 Nettervilles, and Reformation, 599
 Neufchâtel, Farel, 115
 Neville, *see* Westmorland
 Newcastle-on-Tyne, Knox, 443
 New England, Puritanism, 117
 Newman, Sir Thady, and Wolf, 597
 Nicaea, Council of, 666
 Nice, and France, 322
 Nicholas of Cusa, ab 103
 — I, Pope, quo 692
 Nicosia, fortress, 267
 Niesssen, Fr, S J, Stockholm, 333
 Nieuport, Farnese at, 281
 Nîmes, Calvinists, 125
 Niort, Huguenots, 262
 Noailles, de, French Ambassador, 130
 Nobletz, Michel Le, 329
 Nominalists, 36, 145
 Nordlingen, 88, battles of, 307 f, 310
 Norfolk, Ds of, and Henry VIII, 421, and Mary Q of Scots, 135
 Norfolk, Earl of, and Scottish campaign, 534 f
 Normandy, English duchy of, 7
 Norreys, Admiral, 289 f
 North, Lord, and Bp of Ely, 466 f
 Northumberland, Earl of, *see* Bl Thomas Percy
 — (Dudley), D of, and Edward VI, 128, 383, 414, 437, 441, 443, 446, 456, 719
 Norway and Denmark, 14, 97, 301, 334, 718
 Norwich, Bp of, 381, clergy of, 470 n
 Notre Dame, Filles de, 324
 Nottingham, Charles I, 346
 Novgorod, merchants, 24
 Noyon, Calvin, 106 f, 112, chapter of, 110
 Nugents, and Reformation, 599
 Nuremberg, 20, 23, and Augsburg, 90, Diet of, 74 ff, 178 f, Hansa, 25, Lutherans, 73, Peace of, 95, and Speier, 88
 Nymegen, battle near, 277, Canisius, 210, Farnese, 281 f
 Oates, Titus, plot, 627
 Oblates of St Charles, 206
 — of St Ambrose, 206
 O'Brien, Bp, *see* MacBrien
 O'Byrnes, and Elizabeth, 595
 Ochino, Bernardino, apostasy of, 161, 705
 O'Connell, Daniel, 628
 O'Connor, Charles, and Catholics, 628
 Oder R, 315
 O'Devany, Cornelius, Bp of Down, 625
 O'Doherty, ref 577 n
 O'Donnell, Hugh of Tu-Connail, and Elizabeth, 621 f
 O'Donnells, and O'Neill, 600
 Oecolampadius, John, 73, 89
 O'Gallagher, Redmond, Bp of Derry, 619
 — Bp of Killala, 617
 Ogilvie, Bl John, S J, 218 n, 544 n
 — Walter, 218 n
 O'Hely, Patrick, Bishop of Mayo, 616 ff, 618 f
 O'Herlihy, Thomas, Bp of Ross, 619
 O'Hurley, Dermot, Abp of Cashel, 619
 Oldenbarneveldt, Arminian, 337 f
 Olier, J J, 252 n, 325, 328 f
 Olivetan, Pierre Robert, and Calvin, 110
 Olmutz, Jesuits, 302
 O'Neill, Con, Prince of Tyrone, 579
 — Sir Felim, 612
 — Hugh, and Elizabeth, 621 f
 — Shane, and Elizabeth, 593, 595, 598 ff, 602, and Stucley, 609
 d'O, Maiquis, 260 f
 d'Oppède, of Aix, 711
 Optatus of Milevi, St, 667
 'Oracles' *see* 'Manor Rights'.
 Orange, Calvinists in, 125, princes of, *see* Philibert, William
 Oratory, foundation of, 153 ff, in France, 325 f, 328 f., Ranke, 163, 202 ff

- Ordinal*, Ci'anmei's, 430, 452
 Orders, Anglican, 452, 463 f
 Ordination, 418 f, 444 f, 587, 589
 Ori, Inquisitor, and Calvin, 121
 Original sin, Luther on, 38, 90, 143,
 334, Erasmus, 81 f, Trent, 187, 194
 Orleans, Cathari, 675, Protestants, 110,
 113, 237 f, 242, 244, 247, 257
 Ormonde, Earls of, and Cromwell, 627,
 and Desmond, 606, Henry VIII, 566,
 578
 O'Rourke, Conor, 618
 Orléans, Huguenots, 125, 250, 713
 Ortiz, Ambassador, and Jesuits, 172,
 and Le Fèvre, 210
 Orvieto, Cathari in, 678, Gardiner at,
 387
 Osiander, Andreas, 75, 394
 Oslo, 301 n
 Osnabrück, Treaty of, 310, 313, 315 ff
 d'Ossat, Armand, Cardinal, 223
 Ossory, Abp of, 587, 595
 O'Taig, Donat, Abp of Armagh, 598
 O'Toole, and Elizabeth, 595
 Otto, D of Brunswick-Lüneburg, 83
 Oudewater, Arminius at, 336
 Our Lady Help of Christians, Feast of,
 269
 Overysel, revolt of, 276
 Oxenstierna, Axel, Chancellor of
 Sweden, 307 f, 310
 Oxford, Bp of, 379, Browne, 568,
 Cathari, 679, Catholics, 219, chan-
 tries, 638, clergy, 433, Cooper, 476,
 Curwen, 601, Peter Martyr, 161 n,
 436, Pole, 456, Protestant martyrs,
 413, Puritans, 603, Reynolds, 222,
 de Soto, 215 n, Tractarians, 452,
 465, 471
 Pablo de Santa María, Bp of Burgos,
 and Jews, 698
 Pack, Otto, 86 f
 Paderborn, Jesuits, 212
 Padua, Bellarmine, 221, Pole, 456, da
 Thiene, 154, and Venice, 15
 Pagane, widow, 694
 Paget, Sir William, and Somerset, 128,
 428 f, 719
 Palatinate, Calvinists, 334, 714, and
 England, 305, 341, Thirty Years'
 War, 230, 294, 298, 311, 313
 Pale, Irish, 7, 565, 577 f, 594, 599, 620,
 624
 Pallavicini, Pietro Sforza, ref 707
 Pampluna, siege of, 164, 210
 Pamphleteers, Tudor, 433 f
 Pannier, M, quo 113
 Papacy, diplomacy of, 6, 15, 95, 318 f,
 dispensations, 474, and English
 Reformation, 127 f, 130, 133, 284 f,
 354 ff, 360 ff, 364 ff, 370 f, 376,
 387 ff, 394 ff, 400, 418, 422, 448 f,
 457 ff, 461, 463, 466, 472, 478 f, 493,
 633 ff, 640 ff, and Henry IV, 223,
 Indulgences, 41 ff, 45, and Inquisi-
 tion, 321, 669 ff, 697, 701, 703 ff,
 and Ireland, 565 ff, 570, 573 ff,
 577 ff, 586, 593, 596 ff, 606 ff,
 612 ff, 619, 621 ff, 651 ff, and
 Jesuits, 173 f, 222, and Jews, 698,
 and Luther, 47, 49 ff, 74, 98, 141,
 145, 148, 178, Oratory, 204, Papal
 States, 8 n, 14 f, 331, Pragmatic
 Sanction, 237, and Renaissance, 142,
 704, and Scotland, 493 f, 503 ff,
 535, 543, 545, 554, 644 ff, taxation,
 75, 149, 180, 206, 364, 386, and
 Trent, 180 ff, 189, 191, and Turks,
 267, and Zwinglians, 56, 61, 336
 Paris, Bellarmine, 222, Duperion,
 223 f, de Sales, 322 f, Ignatius,
 171 f, 209, Maldonado, 218, Meaux
 group, 102, Palement, 697, Servetus,
 121 n, Vincent de Paul, 327 ff, Wars
 of Religion, 113, 237 ff, 242, 246,
 248, 250, 252, 256 ff, 261
 Paris University, Calvin, 107 ff, 111,
 Erasmus, 108, Ignatius, 171; Pole,
 456, Collège de France, 111, de
 Cardinal Lemoine, 103, de la Marche,
 107 f, Montaigu, 103, 108 f, 171,
 and see Sorbonne
 Parker, Matthew, Abp of Canterbury,
 133, 385, 406, 468, 476, 485 f, 603.
 Parliament, English, and Reformation,
 127, 133 f, 340, 355, 377 f, 384,
 386 ff, 394, 396, 398, 403 ff, 416,
 420 f, 427 f, 431 ff, 435 f, 439, 442,
 445, 465 ff, 469 f, 474, 484 f, and
 Charles I, 342 ff, and Ireland, 627 f,
 and Marian settlement, 458 ff, 462,
 and Presbyterians, 474 f, and Recu-
 sancy laws, 658, Declaration of Tran-
 substantiation, 628
 — Irish, and Reformation, 568, 570,
 578, 587, 593, 604, 607, 651 ff, and
 Treaty of Limerick, 628, 656 f.
 — Scottish, 644 f
 Parma, and France, 309, D of, see
 Farnese, Margaret, Duchess of, see
 Margaret
 Parr, Q Catherine, 422
 Parris, George, heretic, 411 f.
 Pasquier, Eustache, quo 36 n., 239,
 243 n, 246, 263
 Passau, Treaty of, 99 f., 313.
 Pastor, on Popes, quo 154 f, 160, 173 n.,
 204 n, 205 n, 270 n, 271 n, 708 n,
 713 n

- Paterson, Dr., ref 520
 Patrick, Dr., ref 518 n
 — St., 573, 580, 583
 Paul, St., al 33, 57, Reformers on, 37 f., 59, 511
 — III, Pope, *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia*, 157, 180, and Inquisition, 708, and Ireland, 574 f., 579, and Jesuits, 172, 174, and Lutherans, 113, 704 f., and Ochino, 161, and Pole, 200, 457, and Trent, 180 ff., 186 f.
 — IV, Pope, 155 f., and Alva, 274, and England, 284, and Inquisition, 708, and Ireland, 590, and Jesuits, 173 n., and Lutheranism, 704 ff., and Pole, 459, and Trent, 189
 — V, Pope, and Capuchins, 161, and Orders, 324, and Suarez, 216
 Paulius, Nikolaus, quo 43, 185 n
 Pavant, Jacques, 109
 Pavia, battle of, al 85 n
 Pazmany, Peter Cardinal, 330 f
 Pearson, A F Scott, ref 487 n
 Peasantry, 19 ff., and Luther, 72 n., 79 f., Peasants' Revolt, 72, 78 ff., 152, Thirty Years' War, al 96, 229 f
 Peacock, Reginald, Bp of Chichester, 368
 Pelagius, and St Augustine, 36, 194, Pelagians, 196, new Pelagians, 413
 Pelican, Conrad, *see* Kurschner
 Pepm., and Pope Zachary, 683
 Percy, Bl Thomas, 136
 Perez, Antonio, trial of, 280, 703
 Perpignan, capture of, 309
 Persons, Robert, S J., 137, 208 n., 479, 482
 Perrin, Ami, and Calvin, 120 ff
 Perrot, John, President of Munster, 610, 612
 Persecution, religious, 663 ff
 Perth, Lambe at, 499, Parliament, 649, Reformers, 125, 528, 537
 Pertz, G H., 676 n
 Peter, St., al 59
 — of Alcantara, St., 224
 — Arbues, St., 702
 — Canisius, St., S J., 205 n., 207 f., 210, 293, 295, Catechism, 213, Henry II, 241, Poland, 219, 332, and Staphylus, 221, Switzerland, 336, Trent, 216
 — Canterbury, on heretics, 677
 — of Castelnau, legate, 681
 — Faber, St., 171, 208, 210
 — Fourier, St., 324 f
 — Panuzo, St., 678 f
 — of San Crysogone, Cardinal-Legate, and Albigensians, 680
 — Martyr, Reformer, *see* Vermigli
 Peter's Pence, Henry VIII, 635
 Peterborough, Bprc of, 379
 Petition of Right, 342
 Petri, Petersen, Lars, 73 f
 Petrucci, Quietist, 710
 Philibert, Prince of Orange, 157
 Philip, D of Brunswick-Grubenhagen, 83
 — I, Ct of Flanders, 678
 — Augustus II, K of France, and heretics, 676
 — IV, le Bel, K of France, 696
 — Landgrave of Hesse, 79, 88 f., 92, 97, and Charles V, 98, and Pack, 86, Schmalkaldic League, 93 ff., and League of Torgau, 83, 85
 — Neri, St., 162, 210 ff., 225, 325
 — II, K of Spain, 130 ff., 138, 264 ff., al 298, 321, and Anthony of Bourbon, 245, Douai, 219, Elizabeth of France, 240, and Elizabeth of England, 282 ff., 289, 478, 721, and Inquisition, 703, and Ireland, 608 ff., 612 ff., 622, and Mary Tudor, 458 f., 640, 655, Netherlands, 270 ff., Portugal, 320, and Scotland, 551, and Stapleton, 220, and Tient, 190, and Turks, 268 ff.
 Philip III, K of Spain, and Ferdinand II, 297
 Philipsburg, and Fiance, 315
 Philippists, 334
 Philippson, Martin, quo 88
 Philipson, quo 706 n
 Piacenza, Duchy of, 331
 Piaget, Arthur, quo 113 n
 Picardy League, 253
 Pilgrimage of Grace, 128, 379 f., 382, 720
 Piot, B., ref 290
 Piotikow, Synod of, 219
 Pius IV, Pope, and Borromeo, 205 f., and Elizabeth, 133, and Hosius, 219, and Inquisition, 703, 707, and Ireland, 593, and Jesuits, 173 n., and Seminaries, 200 f., and Trent, 186, 189 f.
 — V, Pope St., 266 f., and Elizabeth, 136 f., 208, 478, 608, 721, and Inquisition, 703, 706 ff., and Ireland, 605, 608 ff., and Netherlands, 271, 273, 277
 — IX, Pope, 338
 'Placards', French, 113, 236 f., 710, 712
 Place, La, *see* La Place
 Planche, Regnier de la, quo 243, 263
 Plantations, 111sh, 604 f., 610, 612, 626 f
 Plat, Le, *see* Le Plat
 Platonism, 358

- Plunkett, Bl Oliver, Abp of Armagh, 627
 Pluralities, 42, 142, 180, 381, 602
 Plymouth, Armada, 284, 287, 289
 Poissy, Colloquy of, 245, 712 f
 Poitiers, Edict of, 253, Henry IV, 261, League, 257, Protestants, 238, 242
 Poland, 13 f, 332, Danzig, 231, and Henry III, 251, Jesuits, 214, and Prussia, 85, Reformers, 126, and Sweden, 305, 309, 719, Thirty Years' War, 233
 Pole, Reginald Cardinal, 180 n, 186, 200, 215, 393 ff, 402, 417, 451, 456 ff, and Ireland, 590
Politiques, 251, 254, 257 f, 260 f
 Pollard, Prof A F, quo 283 f, 367 n, 386 n, 387 n, 397 n, 410, 412 n, 465
 Pollen, A H, S J, 208 n, 515 n, 721 n
 Poltrot de Méré, Jean, 247, 249
 Pomerania, 17 f, 314 f, Lutherans, 96, Sweden, 231, 305 f, 310 f, 333, Wallenstein, 303
 Pomponne, quo 315
 Ponnelles, L, ref 201 n, 203 n., 204 n
 Pons, Huguenots, 262
 Pontecorvo, Papal State, 331
 Popelinière, *see* La Popelinière
 Portland, Armada, 287
 Portsmouth, Buckingham, 343
 Portugal, English, 289 f, Fitzmaurice, 616 f, Inquisition, 697, Indies, 209, Jesuits, 208, and Spain, 282, 285 n, 320 f, Trent, 190, trade, 26
 Posen, Jesuits in, 332
 Possevino, Antonio, S J, 333
 Poullat, ref 290
 Pouy, St Vincent de Paul at, 326
 Power, Peter, Abp of Ferns, 619
Praemunire, Statutes of, 365 ff, 386 ff, 397, 403, 428, 466, 633 ff, 640 ff, 651, 653, 655, 721
 Pragmatic Sanction, al 237, 710
 Prague, Defenestration, 297 f, Jesuits, 212, 330, Rudolph, 294, and Sweden, 310; Thirty Years' War, 299, Treaty of, 308, Wallenstein, 302
 Prayer Book, First, 385, 405 f, 414, 428, 430, 433, 435 f, 638 f, Second, 386, 436, 439, 442 f, 639 f, in Ireland, 582 ff, 655.
 Predestination, 38, 65, 115, 124 f, 143, 336 f
 Presbyterians, 347, 463, 474 f, 483 ff, 538 ff, 549, 553 f
 Pressburg, Diet of, 293, Pazmany, 331
 Prices, 20 ff, 30, fixed price, 30, 228
 Prierias, Sylvester, and Luther, 49
 Printers, 70, 339
 Priscillian, al 667, death of, 668 f
 Private judgement, theory of, 583
 Privy Seal, Register of, 513
 Proctors, Irish, 652
 Propaganda, Congregation of, 162
 Property, rights of, 29 f
 Protestants, 5 f, 31 ff, 139 ff, 233, 305, Protestant League, 93, and Speier, 87 f, Protestant States, 332 ff, *see* Calvinism, Huguenots, Lutheranism
 Provisors, Statute of, 365
 Prussia, foundation of, 13, Lutherans, 85
 Prynne, William, 343, 362
 Puchesse, G Baguenault de, ref 263
 Puffendorf, quo 314
 Purgatory, doctrine of, 190, 498
 Puritans, 117 f, 339 f, 402, 407, 413, 463, 468, 475, 482, 486 ff, 722
 Pym, and Charles I, 345 f
 Pyrenees, Treaty of, 312
 Quercy, Huguenots, 251
 Quietists, and Inquisition, 708, 710
 Quintana, Juan de, 121.
 Radziwil, Prince Michael, 332
 Ragazzoni, Bp Girolamo, at Trent, 192
 Rakoczy, Prince, 331.
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, quo 250
 Ramírez, preacher, 216
 Randall, Thomas, 530 f, 532, 537
 Randolph, Thomas, 532 f
 Ranke, Leopold von, quo. 154 f, 163, 191, 682
 Raphael, Sanzio, al 31
 Raphoe, Bp of, 565, 600
 Ratisbon, Catholic League, 76, Diet of, 97, 300, 305, Guilds, 23, 26, Jesuits, 212, 549
 Raulin, Jean, O S B, 103, 153
 Ravenna, and Venice, 15.
 Rawson, Prior of Kilmainham, 574.
 Raymund Lull, al 103
 — Roger, Count of Languedoc, 674
 — V, Count of Toulouse, and Cathari, 680 ff
 — VI, Count of Toulouse, and Cathari, 681 ff
 — Volguier, heretic, 694
 Reason, St Thomas More on, 369, Reformers on, 33, 67 f, 82, 145
 Recared, K of Visigoths, 671
 Recusancy laws, 340, 342, 439 f, 480, 622, 625 ff, 639 ff, 644 ff, 720 ff
 Red Book, The, 333
 Redier, Antoine, ref 326 n

- Reggio, Duchy of, 331
 Regis, St Francis, *see* Francis
 Regius, Urban, Lutheran, 73
Regnans in excelsis, Bull, 721
 Reid, Robert, Abbot, 510
 Reinach, M., quo 690
 Reinhard, Anne, 63
 Religion, Articles of, 414
 Remonstrance, Irish, 627
 — Grand, 346
 Remonstrants, Arminian, 337
 Renee, Duchess of Ferrara, and Calvin, 113
 Rents, 17 f., Rentenkauf, 30
 Requesens, Don Luis de, 277 f
 Restitution, Edict of, 303
 Restraint of Appeals, 396 ff., 401, 404, 634
 Retreats, 327, *see* Jesuits, *Exercises*
 Reuchlin, John, and Melanchthon, 46
 Reutlingen, town of, 88, 90
 Reynolds, John, and Bellarmine, 222
 — Dr Richard of Sion, 355 f
 — William, 222 n
 Rheims, Councils of, 676, 678, English College, 222 n, 482, Henry IV, 261, Irish, 622
 Rhine, trade, 25
 Rhineland, agriculture, 18, Thirty Years' War, 230, 232, 306 f., witchcraft, 18
 Riccardi, Mgr., and Galileo, 709
 Richard II, K. of England, and heresy laws, 409, 634, *Praemunire*, 651, 653
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 304 ff., 310 f., 317, 319, 322, and England, 341 f., and Huguenots, 263, 714
 Ridley, Nicholas, Bp of London, 130, 215 n, 383, 385 f., 413, 434, 440, 442, 444, 454, 456, 487
 Riga, Bprc of, 291
 Rinuccini, Giovanni Battista, Legate, 626
 Ritchie, J., ref 129
 Ritterschaft, 47, and Luther, 77 f
 Rivoli, Treaty of, 309.
 Robert Bellarmine, St, 207, 214, 217, 221
 — le Bougre, Inquisitor, 689
 Robert Grosseteste, St, Bp of Lincoln, 360 f., 389, 461
 — the Pious, K. of France, 675
 Rochester, Bprc of, 381
 Rochford, Lord, and Browne, 572
 Rocroi, battle of, 310.
 Rodriguez, Simon, and Ignatius, 171
 Roger of Hoveden, ref 673
 — II, Bp of Chalons, and Cathari, 676
 Rogers, Thorold, quo 21
 Romagna, Papal State, 331
 Roman Empire and Christianity, 664 ff
 Rome, 14 f., Alva, 274, St Angela m, 176, St Angelo, 86, Borromeo, 206, Cajetan, 215, Capuchins, 160 f., Cranmer, 394, English College, 137, 200, English martyrs, 482, English exiles, 610, 613 f., German College, 200, Inquisition, 684, Irish m, 610, Jesuits, 170, 172 f., 211, 216, 218, 221, Luther m, 35, Oratorians, 154, 202 ff., retreats, 327, Roman College, 200, Sack of, 84, 86, 156, 158, 179, 182, St Peter's, 42, 210 f., Vatican, 201 f., St Vincent de Paul, 326
 'Rome-runners', 566
 Romuald, St, Camaldoles, 159
 Ronne, V., ref 17 n
 Ronsard, Pierre de, 223.
 Roper, Wm., 220
 Rose of Lima, St, 321
 Roses, Wars of, 7
 Ross, Bps of, 565
 Rothe, Dr, at Drogheda, 625
 Rothenburg, Philip of Hesse, 97
 Rottan, Calvinist, and Henry IV, 260
 Rotterdam, Grotius, 337
 Rouen, Calvinists, 238 f., 246, Henry IV, 261, Placards, 113
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, al 709
 Roussel, Gerard, 104 ff., 111 f
 Roussillon, and France, 309
 Roust, burgomaster, and Zwingli, 64
 Ruble, A de, ref 263
 Rudolph II, Emperor, 293 f
 Rudolstadt, Bible at, 35
 Rugen, Island of, 315, 333
 Ruremonde, Farnese at, 281
 Russia, 13, trade, 24
 Sabatier, Guillaume, 694
 Sabbath, keeping of, 341, 472
 Sacraments, and Reformers, 49, 67, 90, 196 f., 417, 421 f., 431 ff., 586, and *see under*
 Sadler, Sir Ralph, in Scotland, 494 ff., 498 ff., 506 f., 522, 526, 530 ff., 537 n
 Sadolet, Jacopo, Bp of Carpentras, 110 f., 154, 180, 711
 Sadoleti, J., ref 101
 St Albans, monks of, 363
 Saint-André, Jacques d'Albon de, Marshal of France, 244 ff
 St Andrews, Abp of, 532, Prior of, 530, *Records*, 539 ff., 543, Reformers, 443, 529, 537, University, 510
 St Bartholomew, Massacre of, 248 ff., 276, 712 f.

- St Blaise, Abbey of, 78
 Saint-Brès, conference at, 255
 Saint-Cloud, Henry III, 258
 St Denis, battle of, 248, Conference of, 223, Henry IV, 261
 St Die, Calvinists, 125
 Sainte-Foy, Synod of, 261
 Saintes, Calvinists, 238
 St Gall, and Speier, 88, Zwingli, 94
 St Germain, Christopher, 390, 403, 407 n
 St Germain-des-Prés, Lefèvre, 103 f
 St Germain-en-Laye, Treaty of, 248, 309
 St Jean-d'Angely, Protestants, 238, 262
 St Jean-de-Losne, 309
 St John, Knights of, 266 ff
 St Lazare, St Vincent de Paul, 327 f
 Saint-Lo, Duperron, 223
 St Malo, Fitzmaurice, 613
 St Nicholas de Chardonnet, Bourdouise, 326, 328
 Saint-Omer, Beggars' Revolt, 273
 Sauntonge, Calvin, 112
 St Paul, Sons of, 159
 St Peter's, building of, 42 f, 45
 St Sulpice, 325, 329
 St Victor, school of, 103
 Salamanca, Carmelites, 217, Ignatius at, 170, Suarez, 216
 Sales, St Francis de, *see* Francis
 Salez de Baldi, Marina, 163
 Salisbury, Countess of, *see* Margaret
 Salmeron, Alphonso, S J, and Ignatius, 171, in Ireland, 579, on Scripture, 217, Trent, 187, 216
 Salonika, Moriscos, 265
 Salvati, nuncio, quo 249
 Salzburg, Bp. of, and Philip of Hesse, 86
 Samland, Bp. of, and Luther, 85
 San-Chan I, Xavier, 210
 Sandelands, James, notary, 560
 Sander, Dr Nicholas, in Ireland, 613, 617
 San Giorgio Maggiore, monastery, 160
 San Girolamo, Neri, 202.
 Sanson, Bernardin, Franciscan, 59
 Santa Cruz, Marquis of, 285 f
 Saragossa University, St Vincent de Paul, 326
 Sardinia, and Spain, 321
 Sarum use, 435, 437
 Saumur, Protestants, 125, 223, 262
 Savine, A, ref 381 n
 Savonarola, 15, 704
 Savoy, duchy of, 16, and France, 309, 322, St Francis de Sales, 322, and Geneva, 114, 244 n, Papacy, 331, Trent, 190, Waldenses, 237
 Sawtre, Lollard, 409, 412 n
 Saxe-Weimar, *see* Bernard of Saxons, Charlemagne, 672.
 Saxony, agriculture, 231, Calvinists, 714, and Denmark, 301 f, Elector of, 20, 88, and Luther, 31, 42, 44, 47 n, 51 ff, 85, 183, 334 f, Schmalkaldic Wars, 93, 96, 98, Thirty Years' War, 294, 299 ff, 307 f, 313, *see* Maurice of
 Scandinavia, union of, 14, Inquisition, 685, persecution, 718 f, trade, 229, *see* Denmark, Norway, Sweden
 Schaumberg, Silvester von, and Luther, 47
 Scheel, Otto, on Luther, 37 n, 38 n
 Scheldt, Leicester, 285, Spaniards, 287
 Schiller, al 233
 Schindel, T T, 69
 Schlackau, Ochino at, 161 n
 Schleswig, duchy of, 303
 Schmalkaldic League, 88, 93 ff, 96 ff, 335, War, 188 f, 296, 311, 714
 Schmidlin, ref 210 n
 Schmidt, ref 677 n, 695
 Schools, English, 129, 483, Irish, 607, 620, 627, Jesuits, 212, Luther, 72, Scotish, 502, 509, 558, 646 ff, Thirty Years' War, 234
 Scholasticism, 145, 147, 151, 672.
 Schornbaum, Karl, ref 335 n
 Schwabach, Articles of, 89.
 Schweinfurt, Schmalkaldic League, 94
 Scotland, 7, Armada, 288, Charles I, 344, 347, Calvinists, 125 f, 486, free churches, 85 n, Henry IV, 259, and Ireland, 611 f, Reformation, 135, 443, 478, 493 ff, 644 ff, 723
 Scipoli, Lorenzo, 156, 224
 Scurlock family, 599
 Seville, Inquisition, 700 f.
 Sebastian, K of Portugal, and Stucley, 617
 Sedan, Calvinists, 125
 Sedulius, on Luther, 185
 Seebohm, Professor, quo 5.
 Segà, Mgr, and Fitzmaurice, 617
 Selden, quo 479 n
 Selim II, Turk, 266
 Seminaries, 190 f, 198, 200 f, 208 n, 324 f, 328 f, 597, 621, 642, 649.
 Sens, Calvinists, 238, Council of, 181, Duperion, 224
 Sentleger, Lord Deputy, 578, 584 f
 Serafino di Montegranaro, St, 162
 Serfs, 17, 78, 230, 330.
 Seripando, Girolamo, and Luther, 36 f, 160, Trent, 187 f.
 Sermoneta, Cardinal, and Scotland, 515

- Servetus, Michael, execution of, 121, 716 f
 Servien, delegate, and Mazarin, 314
 Seton, Lord, Chancellor, 555
 Seville, Moriscos, 266
 Sevis, St Fidelis at, 162
 Seymour, Q Jane, 416, 422
 Sforzas, and Charles V, 15
 Shakespeare, quo 27, 691
 Shaxton, Nicholas, Bp of Salisbury, 421
 Ship money, English, 343
 Shrewsbury, Earl of, and monasteries, 374
Si aduersus vos, Bull, 684, 687
 Sicilian Constitutions, 679
 Sicily, 11, 211, 321
 Sickingen, Franz von, and Luther, 47, 77
 Sienna, Inquisition, 706
 Siere, Alazais, 694
 Sigismund II, K of Poland, 332
 Sigismund III, K of Sweden and Poland, 333, 719
 Silesia, Thirty Years' War, 230, 232, 294
 'Silk Route', Chinese, 15
 Silva, Ruy Gomez de, and Philip II, 274
 Simon, Richard, and Maldonado, 218
 Sinope, trade, 15
 Sion, English martyrs of, 355
 Siricius, Pope St, 669
 Six Articles, 405, 410 f, 414, 417, 421, 427, 431, 437 f, 476, 582, 636
 Sixteen, The, 257
 Sixtus IV, Pope, and Inquisition, 698, 701
 — V, Pope, and Bellarmine, 222, and Henry of Navarre, 255
 Skerett, Bp of Tuam, 619
 Skinner, Bp, al 443 n.
 Slawata, Governor of Bohemia, 297 f
 Smerwick, massacre of, 618
 Smith, G H, ref 69
 — Preserved, ref 69
 — Dr Richard, 219, 411
 — Sir Thomas, 420 n, 429
 Smythe, C H, ref 417, 434 n, 445, 720
 Socinianism, Poland, 332
 Socrates, eccl historian, ref 668 n
 Soissons, Cathari, 677
 Solway Moss, James V, 723
 Solymann the Magnificent, 11 f, 16, 84 f, 266, Vienna, 89, 95
 Somascans, 158, 162, 200, 207
 Somerset, Protector, 128, 411 f, 427 ff, 437 ff, 448 f, 456, and Ireland, 584, and Scotland, 723.
 Sorbonne, Reformers, &c 104 ff, 109, 112, 236, Jesuits, 171, 214, 218
 Soto, Domenico de, Thomist, 215
 — Pedro de, Thomist, 215
 Southwell, Charles I at, 347
 Sozomen, quo 668
 Spain, 10, 264 ff, 320 f, and America, 10 f, and Burgundy, 8 n, and England, 7, 130 f, 136, 138, 282 ff, 341, 458 f, 478 f, 481, Inquisition, 238, 695, 697 f, and Ireland, 605, 607 ff, 612 ff, 618, 621 ff, and Italy, 14 f, 331, and Netherlands, 260 f, 312, 717 f, Thirty Years' War, 233, 298 f
 Spee, Friedrich von, S J, 234 f
 Speier, Diet of, 76, 83 f, 86 ff, 183, Gustavus, 306, Jesuits, 212
 Spenser, Edmund, in Ireland, 622
 Spottiswoode, John, Abp of Glasgow, and Winzet, 537
 Spy system, Elizabethan, 609, 611
 Stadtlohn, battle of, 300
 Stahelin, R, ref 55 n
 Standish, Henry, Bp of St Asaph, 369 f
 Standonck, Jean, rector of Montaigu, 103
 Stanislas Kostka, St, 207
 Staphylus, Frederick, and Stapleton, 220 f
 Staples, Edward, Bp of Meath, 572 ff, 582, 584
 Stapleton, Thomas, 219 f, 222, quo 409 n
 Starkey, Thomas, and Cardinal Pole, 458
 State, sovereignty of, 382 f, 397 ff, 408 f, State Church, Calvin, 115 f, English, 353, *see* Supremacy, Royal, Lutheran, 53 f, 71, 85, 141, 169
 Staupitz, Dr, and Luther, 34
 Steen, Cornelius van den, *see* Lapide
 Sterling, John, al 456
 Stettin, and Sweden, 315, 333
 Stiefel, Michael, 73
 Stirling, Reformation in, 529, 533
 Stockholm, Jesuits, 333
 Stokesley, John, Bp of London, 419, 423
 Stotternheim, Luther at, 33
 Strafford, Earl of, impeachment, 343 ff
 Straffillan, school, 559
 Stralsund, siege of, 303
 Strasbourg, and Augsburg, 92, Hansa, 25, Reformers, 73, 88, 113, 115 f, 161 n, 243, 441, 471
 Strengnas, Diet of, 73
 Strype, John, ref 128 n, 129, 134 n, 383 n, 413, 416, 464, 719 n
 Stuarts, 7, 319, and Ireland, 624 ff,

- and Popes, 505 f, *see* Charles, James, Mary
 Stuart, Lord James, 529 f, 534, 545, *see* Murray
 Stubbs, Philip, 485 f
 Stubner, and Luther, 53
 Stucley, Thomas, and Ireland, 608 ff, 613 ff, 616 f
 Stuhlweissenburg, battle of, 162, Ferdinand at, 85
 Styria, Ferdinand II, 295 f, Habsburgs, 11, Lutherans, 292 f
 Suarez, Francisco, S J, 216 f, 321
 Succession, Act of, 400 f
 Suffolk, D of, and monasteries, 374
 Sully, D de, al 263
 Sulpicians, 252 n
 Sulpicius Severus, quo 668
Supralapsarians, 337
 Supremacy, Royal, 387 ff, 398, 403 f, 410, 415 f, 418 f, 421, 448, 451 ff, 460, 464, 478 ff, 484 f, 633 ff, 638 ff, and Ireland, 554, 566 ff, 575 ff, 578, 589 ff, 597, 641, 651 f, 654 f, Act of, 133 i, 400 ff, 411 f, 465, 469 f, 477 ff, 482, 720
 Suso, Bl Henry, 40
 Sussex, D of, Lord Deputy of Ireland, 136, 594 f, 597
 Swabian League, 79, 307 f
 Sweden, 14, 231 f, 384, Lutheranism, 73 f, 332 f, 718 f, Thirty Years' War, 303 ff, 309 ff, 374 ff
 Swiss College, Milan, 201, Swiss mercenaries, 56, 60
 Switzerland, 16, Reformers, 31, 54 ff, 93 f, 336, 434, *see* Geneva
 Sydney, Sir Henry, Lord Deputy of Ireland, 599 f, 602 ff, 607, 609, 614
 Syria, Lepanto, 268
 Tacchi-Venturi, historian, 154 n
 Talavera, Ferdinand, Abp of Granada, 702
 Talbot, Peter, Abp of Dublin, 627
 Talmud, Jewish, 689 f
 Talpa, Fr, quo 204 n
 Tanner, Edmund, S J, Bp. of Cork, 614, 619
 Tannizey de Larroque, ref 681 n
 Tanon, ref 674 n, quo 693
 Tapate, Fray Garcia de, 699
 Taube, quo 82
 Tauler, John, and Luther, 40
 Tavannes, General, at Montcontour, 248
 Tawney, R H, ref 129, 483
 Taxation, Alva, 275 f, Church, 504 ff
 Teinds, Scottish, 519, 546
 Templars, suppression of, 696 f
 Ten Articles, 415 f, 420, 426
 Terceira, battle of, 285 n
 Teresa, St, of Avila, 164 n, 224 ff, 321
 Tertullian, al 665
 Tetzel, John, O P, and Indulgences, 43 f
 Teutonic Knights, 13, 85
 Theatines, 154 ff, 162 f, 200, 207
 Theiner, A, ref 199
 Theodorus, St, 667
 Theodosius I, Roman Emperor, 667 ff
 Thiene, Count Gaetano da, *see* Cajetan, St
 Thurlby, Thomas, Bp of Westminster, 432, 436, 456
 Thirty-nine Articles, 451, 453, 461
 Thirty Years' War, 99 f, 228 ff, 291 ff, 336, 341, 715
 Thomas, St, Apostle, al 220 n
 — Aquinas, St, quo 29 f, 95 n, 210, 217, 689, Thomists, 36, 215, 217, 338
 — Becket, St, and Henry VIII, 420, al 220 n, 389
 — of Lemos, O P, 215
 — More, St, 128, 149, 220, 356 ff, 371 f, 382, 389 f, 400, 402, 409 f, 413, 424, 427, and Pole, 457 f, and Wolsey, 367, *Dialogue concerning Heresies*, 369, *Utopia*, 357 f
 Thomond, Earl of, in France, 609
 Thorens, St Francis de Sales, 322
 Thou, Jacques Auguste de, ref 263
 Thouars, Huguenots at, 262
 Thucydides, quo 233
 Thurn, Count Heinrich von, 297 f
 Thuringia, peasants, 79
 Tiepolo, Venetian Ambassador, 238.
 Tillet, Canon Louis du, 112 f
 Tilly, Count Johannes, 299 f, 303, 305 f
 Tipperary, Fitzmaurice, 612, 618, plantations, 610
 Tir-Connail, Prince of, *see* O'Donnell
 Titelman, Peter, Inquisition, 272.
 Titelmanns, Francis, theologian, 217
 Toledo, Inquisition, 699 f., Visigoths, 671.
 Toleration, Act of, 542 f
 Tone, Wolfe, 628
 Torgau, League of, 83 ff
 Torquemada, Inquisitor, 700 ff
 Toul, 315, Maurice of Saxony, 99.
 Toulouse, Albigensians, 680 ff, Calvinists, 238, Cathari, 675, Councils of, 676, 682, Inquisition, 686, 693, League, 257, Servetus, 121 n., St. Vincent de Paul, 326, Visigothic kingdom, 670.

- Tournai, Beggars, 273
 Tours, Council of, 678, 680, Henry III, 257, Protestants, 113, 238, 243 n
 Towns, 19, 21, German, 231, 233, Huguenots, 262 f, Imperial, 71, and Lutherans, 71, 83 f, 87, 149 f, 152
 Tradition, 187, 193
 Transylvania, and Hungary, 330
 Trastavere, Theatines, 155
 Tremellius, Immanuel, 441
 Trent, Council of, 76, 95, 139 n, 157, 178 ff, 186 ff, 213 ff, 331, 705, Borromeo, 206, Cranmer, 455, France, 322, 328, Hosius, 219, Jesuits, 211, Lutherans, 335, Scotland, 521 f, Seripando, 36, 160
 Treves, Trier, Abp of, 77, Athanasius, 666, Elector of, 13, Jesuits, 212
 Trim, St Mary's Abbey, 573
 Trinity, Confraternity of, 202, doctrine of, 121, 126
 — College, founded, 621
 Trithemius, John, 30
 Tripoli, and Lepanto, 268
 Tronchin, Theodore, at Dordrecht, 337
 Troyes, Calvinists, 238, League, 257
 Truchsess, Gebhard, Abp of Cologne, 291
 — Otto Cardinal, 210
 Tuam, Abps of, and Supremacy, 574, 592, 595
 Tubingen, Vergerio at, 705
 Tudors, 7, *see under*
 Tunis, Lepanto, 268, 270; St Vincent de Paul, 326
 Tunstall, Cuthbert, Bp of Durham, 432, 443, 633
 Turenne, Henri, Marshal, at Nordlingen, 310
 Turks, invasion of, 11 f, 15, 84, 89, 92, 95, 97 f, 152, 162, 229, 264 ff, 292 f, 330 f
 Tuscany, Grand Duchy of, 331
 Tycho-Brahé, astronomer, 293
 Tyndale, William, 371, 390, 424 f, quo 404
 Tyrone, Prince of, *see* O'Neill.
 Ukraine, and Poland, 13
 Uhliorn, Johann, quo 41 n
 Ulm, 23, Hansa, 25, Protestants at, 88
 Ulmus, John ab, 443 n
 Ulrich, D of Wurttemburg, and Hesse, 95; and peasants, 78
 Ulster, bishops, 625, plantations, 612, O'Neill, 600.
 Umbria, Papal State, 331
Umlaut, and Borromeo, 207
 Uniformity, Acts of, 133, 379, 385 f, 428, 430, 437 ff, 441, 443 f, 449, 479, 592, 638 ff, 654 f, 721
 Universities, English, 133, 426, 440, *see under*, Irish, 620, Scottish, 502, 509 ff, 557 f, 646 f, Thirty Years' War, 234, *see* Paris
 Upsala, disputation at, 73
 Urban IV, Pope, and Inquisition, 691—VIII, Pope, 305
 Urbanus, St, 667
 Ursulines, 175 ff, 200, 207, in France, 323
 Usher, R, ref 464
 Usury, growth of, 27 ff, 483, 502
 Uttinger, Canon, and Zwingli, 57
 Ultraquists, 297
 Utrecht, Calvinists, 274, 276, secession of, 281
 Vacandard, E, ref 674 n, 677 n, 694 n, quo 695
 Vadian, Joachim, and Cranmer, 454
 Valencia, Moors, 698, 702
 Valenciennes, Beggars' Revolt, 273
 Valens, Emperor, 667 f
 Valtelline, and Richelieu, 304
 Vallières, Jean, 109
 Vasa, Gustavus, *see* Gustavus I
 Vasquez, Gabriel, S J, 216
 Vassy, massacre, 245 f, 712
 Vasteras, Diet of, 74 n
 Vaudois, massacre of, 711
 Velasquez, Juan, and Ignatius, 163 f
 Venaissin, and Papacy, 8 n, 331, and France, 321
 Venice, republic of, 6, 15, 263, 318, Charles V, 89, and England, 130, 452, Giustiniani, 159, Ignatius, 170, 172, Inquisition, 697, 704 ff, League of Cognac, 84, and Papacy, 331, Theatines, 157, trade, 25 f, Trent, 190, and Turks, 267 ff
 Ventadour, D de, 329 f
 Verden, Bprc of, 311, 315, and Sweden, 333
 Verdun, Maurice of Saxony, 99, France, 315
 Vergerio, Pier Paolo, Bp of Capo d'Istria, 705 f
 Vermigli, Pietro (Peter Martyr), 161, in England, 406, 434, 436 ff, 440 ff, 444, 457 n, and Inquisition, 705
 Verneuil, Protestants at, 242
 Verona, Council of, 680, 682, Giberti, 157, and Venice, 15
 Vertus, Cathari at, 675
 Vervins, Treaty of, 261
 Vestment controversy, 443, 368
 Vézelay, Cathari at, 677

- Vicenza, and Venice, 15
 Victoria, Q., al 472
 Vienna, 23, 28, 304, Turks, 89,
 Zwingli, 55
 Vienne, Calvinists, 238, Inquisition,
 121
 Villefranche, Calvinists, 238
 Vincent Feirer, St., 680
 — de Paul, St., 225, 325 ff
 Vinogradoff, Professor, quo 407
 Vio, Tommaso de, *see* Cajetan
 Viret, Pierre, 113, 114
 Visitation Order, 324
 Vittoria, Francisco, Dominican, 10
 Vives, Ludovico, quo 108
 Voltaire, quo 333
 Vulgate, 187
- Wace, H., ref 69
 Wadding, Luke, Franciscan, 626
 Waldeck, Fianz von, Abp of Munster,
 96
 Waldenses, massacres, 237, 695
 Waldstein, Count Albrecht, *see* Wallenstein
 Wales, annexation of, 7
 Wallenstein, Count Albrecht, 302 ff,
 305, 307, 316
 Walmersheim, Manoi Laws, 18
 Walsh, historian, 1cf 700 n
 — Peter, Franciscan, 627
 — Wm., Abp of Meath, 590, 593
 Walsingham, Sir Francis, 477, 609
 War, Wallenstein's theory of, 203 f
 Ward, W G., 471 n
 Warham, William, Abp of Canterbury,
 367, 389, 394, 425
 Wartburg, Castle of the, Luther, 51,
 53, 58, 169
 Warwick, John Dudley, Earl of, 437,
 585, *see* Northumberland
 Waterford, Reformation, 595, 604, 615,
 622
 Watli, Melchior, and Zwingli, 62
 Wauchope, Robert, Bp of Armagh, 186,
 579
 Waugh, W T., ref 386 n
 Wazo, Bp of Liège, on heretics, 676
 Weimar, Lutherans, 73, 228
 Weiss, Ch., ref 290
 Weller, Jerome, and Luther, 33 n
 Welser, merchants, 26
 Wentworth, Thomas, E of Stafford,
 343 f
 Wesen, Zwingli at, 55
 Westminster, Bprc of, 379
 Westmorland, Neville, Earl of, 136.
 Westphalia, Treaty of, 231, 233 f,
 310 f, 330, 333, 338, 714
 Weston, Dr., Irish Chancellor, 602, 607.
- Wexford, Stucley, 609, massacre of,
 626
 Whigs, and Charles II, 722
 Whitaker, William, and Bellarmine,
 221
 White Hill, battle of the, 299, 330
 Whitgift, Abp John, 385, 464, 468,
 486 f
 Wildhaus, Zwingli at, 55
 Wilkinson, Maurice, quo 253, 257 n
 Willet, Andrew, 464; quo 483
 William, D of Bavaria, and Indulgences, 44
 — of Nassau, P of Orange (the Silent),
 271 ff, 274 f, 290
 — III, K of England, in Ireland, 628,
 656
 Williams, Bp of Lincoln, and Laud,
 344
 Willoughby, Lord, and Henry IV, 259
 Wilna, Jesuits in, 332
 Wilson, Miles, of Cambridge, 383
 Wiltshire, Earl of, 393
 Wimpeling, Jacob, and Germany, 26
 Winchcombe, Abbey of, 370, 380
 Winchester, Bprc. of, 381, 391, 449,
 567
 Windsheim, and Speier, 89.
 Windsor, Canons of, 129, Conferences,
 435, Knox, 444
 Winzett, Ninian, 510, 512, 526, 536 ff,
 542 f, 550, quo 496
 Wishart, George, Reformer, 499 f, 512,
 514, 516 f, 526
 Wismar, Hansa, 231; and Sweden, 315,
 333
 Wissenburg, and Speier, 88
 Witchcraft, 126 n, 228, 234 f
 Wittenberg, 73, 85, 163, 334, 417,
 Luther at, 35, 37 f, 44 ff, 49, 52 f,
 98, 153
 Wolf, Fr., S J., Irish Nuncio, 593,
 597 f, 601 f, 605, 612 ff
 Wolfgang, P of Anhalt-Kothen, 83, 88
 Wolgast, battle of, 303
 Wolfin, Heinrich, and Zwingli, 55
 Wolmar, Melchior, and Calvin, 110
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 8, 366 f, 380, 387 ff,
 391, 446, and Gardiner, 451, and
 Ireland, 566 f, and Pole, 457
 Worms, Diet of, 50 f, 97, 208, 210,
 Edict of, 74, 76, 84, and Sweden,
 306, 308
 Wrothe, Commissioner, and Elizabeth,
 598
 Wullenwever, Jurgen, Anabaptist, 96
 Wundt, W M., quo 58.
 Wurttemburg, Concord of, 96, D. of,
 95; Lutherans, 334, Thirty Years'
 War, 230, 234.

INDEX TO VOLUME IV

Wurzburg, Bp of, 86, Gustavus, 306,
 Jesuits, 212, witches, 234
 Wyatt, Sir Thomas, poet, 456
 Wyclif, John, al 424
 Wynram, John, 512, 537
 Wyse, Thomas, and Catholics, 628
 Wyttenbach, Thomas, and Zwingli, 56,
 59

Xavier, St Francis, *see* Francis
 Ximenes, Cardinal, 44, 59 n, 146, 153

York, Convocation of, 355, 633, 635
Yorkshire Tragedy, 138
 Youghal, priests, 604

Zaccaria, St Antonio Maria, *see* Antonio
 Zachary, Pope St, 683
 Zeeland, revolt, 276, 278 f, 281

Zelo Domus Dei, Bull, 316
 Zerener, Holm, quo 70 n
 Ziegler, Margaret, 31
 Zurich, Coverdale, 425, Guilds, 23,
 Zwingli, 16, 57, 59 ff, 64, 67, 78,
 94, 161, 336

Zusmarshausen, battle of, 310
 Zutphen, capture of, 282
 Zwickau, 'prophets', 52, 78
 Zwilling, Gabriel, and Luther, 52
 Zwingli, Bartholomew, 55
 — Huldreich, 16, 54 ff, 78, 88 f, 93 f,
 109 f, and Calvin, 106, and Luther,
 31, *Archeteles*, 63, *Auslegung und Be-
 grundung*, 64 f, *De Vera et Falsa
 Religione*, 65, *On the Choice or Freedom
 of Food*, 62

Zwinglians, and Calvinism, 126, and
 Cranmer, 434, 439, 463, and Schmal-
 kaldic League, 93

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY